This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

MDCCCXX

INDIANA
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

The Journal

of

Theological Studies

VOLUME XXIX

Reprinted 1965 for
WM. DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON
with the permission of
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

BR 1
.J83
v.29

PRINTED IN ENGLAND AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY JOHN JOHNSON
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

INDIANA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

REPRINTED BY STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LTD., CAXTON HILL, HERTFORD

COMMITTEE OF DIRECTION:

Rev. Dr Barnes, Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
F. C. Burkitt, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
Rev. Dr Cooke, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.
Rev. Dr Kennett, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge.
Very Rev. Dr Kirkpatrick, Dean of Ely.
Rev. Dr Lock, Professor Emeritus, Oxford.
Very Rev. Dr J. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells.
Right Rev. Dr Strong, Bishop of Oxford.

EDITORS:

Rev. Dr Bethune-Baker, 23 Cranmer Road, Cambridge.
Rev. Dr Brightman, Magdalen College, Oxford.

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

OCTOBER, 1927

NOTES AND STUDIES

WESTERN READINGS IN THE SECOND HALF OF ST MARK'S GOSPEL.

THE reason for dealing here with the second half of the Gospel only is simply that this is the part of the Gospel for which we have the evidence of *k*: in other words, the Western evidence for the text is here at its best and strongest. The textual theory of the Gospels which I propounded in the January number of *J. T. S.* (pp. 145–149) involves, if it is justified, the modification of our critical editions by the acceptance of at least a certain number of readings on Western authority only: and in chapter i as there printed purely Western readings were in fact adopted in the text on three occasions and into the margin twice.

The object of the present paper being to reinforce the plea for further consideration of Western readings in St Mark by examining a number of them in succession, it is natural to begin at the point where Western evidence can be presented in the most favourable light. And of *k* we know this, that it gives us the Gospel text which Cyprian used in Africa in the middle of the third century.

But before proceeding to the details of the enquiry it may serve the reader's convenience to have before him a conspectus of the lacunae in our principal authorities.

k is extant for St Mark from viii 8 onwards, save for two small gaps, viii 11–14, 16–19.

From viii 8 to the end of the Gospel Θ and syr-sin are complete.

D is complete as far as xvi 6 Lat., xvi 15 Gr. In other words, that possessor of the MS who wanted to separate from the rest the portion containing the Catholic Epistles as a whole was obliged to take out a leaf containing on the *recto* the Latin of xvi 6–15, and on the *verso* the Greek of xvi 15–20, because the *verso* in question contained also the commencement of the Greek text of the Catholic Epistles.

W is complete, save for the ante-penultimate leaf containing xv 12–38.

e has nothing in this half of Mark but four isolated columns of text (apparently the inner halves of two, probably conjugate, leaves), containing xii 37–40, xiii 2, 3; xiii 24–27, 33–36.

a has lost from xv 15 onwards.

b has lost everything from xiv 61, and nearly everything from xiii 10, onwards.

ff has lost parts of ix 17–33, xvi 15–20.

i has lost x 2–33, xiv 36–xv 33, xv 40–end.

1. viii 26 Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς (I put in each case Westcott and Hort's text first). In *J. T. S.* xxvi p. 18 (Oct. A.D. 1924) I discussed this reading, and shewed that the process of analysis could be carried a stage further back than Hort had carried it: for 'Marcan usage', εἰς for ἐν, points to Μηδὲ (or Μηδενὶ) εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην as the original reading. No Greek authority gives that and nothing more, though D has in fact Μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην as part of its reading: but *k* has 'nemini dixeris in castello' and *c* is even nearer to the true Greek with 'ne cui diceret in castellum'. Read therefore Μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην.

2. viii 38 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, and so Luke ix 26 (with ἂν for ἐάν). Now in Luke the best 'Western' authorities there extant omit λόγους: so D *a e l* syr-sin.[1] But it has been (so far as I know) a factor hitherto unnoticed that the same omission is attested for St Mark by two of our oldest and best Westerns, *k* W. What are we to say? Is λόγους right in both Gospels? or is omission right in both? or, what is *a priori* perhaps the most probable view, is omission right in one Gospel, insertion in the other? But if we adopt this third view, we must certainly attribute the shorter reading to Mark, the longer to Luke: it would surely be incredible that Luke should have omitted λόγους if he had found it in the text of Mark.

Anyhow it is not our business to settle the text of Luke: it is enough to say that if τοὺς ἐμούς (without λόγους) is right in Luke, that is in itself strong testimony to the same reading being right in Mark. But let us suppose that τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους is right in Luke: whence in that case did D *a e l* syr-sin derive the shorter reading but ultimately from Mark, even though the existing text of Mark in all of them (but *e* is not extant for Mark) gives λόγους?

Next what has 'intrinsic probability' got to tell us as between the two readings in St Mark? There is, on the one hand, very little about our Lord's sayings, as such, in Mark: apart from this passage the only two occasions on which the phrase οἱ λόγοι is found are x 24 and xiii 31, while in Luke it occurs at least half a dozen times. On the other hand, St. Mark's Gospel does I think definitely distinguish itself from the others by its special expression of the thought that the Lord and the disciples form a single group: compare, for instance, the 'follows not us' of Mark ix 38 with the 'follows not with us' of Luke ix 49, and see generally Mark ix 37, 41, 42, x 39. The reading ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμούς is naturally strange to us at first: but I venture to think that it corresponds more closely than the alternative to the conceptions that are dominant in this part of St Mark's Gospel.

---

[1] Origen *Exhortatio ad Martyrium* 34, 37 quotes the Lucan passage both with and without the word λόγους.

3. ix 5 *καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς*. So, save for the inversion of *σκηνὰς τρεῖς*[1], Luke ix 33: Matt. xvii 4 has, on the other hand, *εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω*[2] *ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς*, and how are we to account for *εἰ θέλεις*? Now D Θ *fam* 13 565 *b ff i* have in Mark not *καὶ ποιήσωμεν* but *θέλεις ποιήσωμεν* (*ποιήσω* D *b ff i*), and if that is right the text of Mark stands midway between the texts of Matthew and Luke, and accounts for both. It is true that *k* gives *bonum est nobis hic est* | *set faciamus*, which probably stands for *hic esse et*, i. e. the ordinary reading: W *καὶ θέλεις ποιήσω δέ*, *a* too *esse ** si uis f****mus*, though their texts are mixed, recognize *θέλεις*. With *k* and syr-sin supporting ℵ B, the results are not as clear as one would wish: but D W Θ *fam* 13 565 *a b ff i* are a strong group, and to my mind the balance is in favour of θέλεις ποιήσωμεν as (i) giving a good Marcan construction, cf x 36, 51, xiv 12, xv 9, 12, (ii) improving the sense, (iii) accounting for the form given to the sentence by Matthew.

4. ix 18 *ὅπου ἐὰν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ ῥήσσει αὐτόν*. The verb *ῥήσσω* is a collateral form of *ῥήγνυμι*: but it cannot be said that 'breaks' or 'tears' gives a tolerable sense, and L.S. quotes no authority for the sense we want here save this passage only. Obviously the meaning must be 'dashes to the ground' (Euthymius ἀντὶ τοῦ καταβάλλει εἰς γῆν, quoted by Swete), and we are thrown back on the Western reading *ῥάσσει*: so D 565 with *collidit k*, *allidit b i*, *elidit* (ut uid) *ff*, and presumably syr-sin 'casteth him down'. *ῥάσσω* is a collateral form of *ἀράσσω*: it is found some eight times in LXX, and Thackeray *Grammar of the O.T. in Greek* i p. 76 (I owe the reference to Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v. *ῥήγνυμι*) points out that it is 'the LXX form of *ἀράσσω* . . . not an alternative for *ῥήσσω ῥήγνυμι*': generally in a metaphorical sense, but in Dan. viii 10 LXX gives *ἐῤῥάχθη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν* where Theodotion has *ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*. The Concordance shews that the word was either unfamiliar or suspect as colloquial, for on two or three occasions it is in some authorities omitted or altered: even the classical

---

[1] The Western text has *τρεῖς σκηνάς*, but that may perhaps be an assimilation to Matthew and Mark.

[2] Again the Western text (with the mass of authorities) has *ποιήσωμεν*, but once more we may be in presence of an assimilation to Mark and Luke.

form ἀράσσω is hardly ever found in prose writers, though 'it was certainly employed in everyday life' (Rutherford *The New Phrynichus* p. 6). Hermas *Mand.* xi 3 εἴ τινα δυνήσεται ῥάξαι τῶν δικαίων offers an instructive parallel to the passage in Mark—the more instructive that Hermas, like Mark, wrote in Rome and wrote the Greek of everyday life—for the editors print ῥῆξαι, as indeed Clement's text has it, *Strom.* i 17. 85 (Stählin ii p. 55), though the Athos MS has ῥάξαι and the Latin versions respectively *deiciet* and *adlidat*. I have therefore no hesitation in accepting the testimony of the Western authorities in Mark and replacing ῥάσσει in the text.

5. ix 19 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς . . . But καί for ὁ δέ in D W Θ *fam* 1 *fam* 13 28 565 O.L.: and the ἀποκριθεὶς δέ of Matthew and Luke is more likely to have arisen out of the Western reading, since the substitution of δέ for καί is a regular feature of their re-handling of Mark, while ὁ δέ of Mark is left standing fifteen times by Matthew, eleven times by Luke. I do not think I have noticed any instance where both change ὁ δέ of Mark.

6. ix 38 εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια, καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν. So Luke ix 49 (save that for the two words last quoted he has ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν), and so in Mark (apart from the two words in question) ℵ B C L Δ Θ syr-sin. We are concerned on this occasion only with the order of the clauses; not with the tenses of ἐκωλύομεν and ἠκολούθει, and not with the variation ἡμῖν, μεθ' ἡμῶν, of which ἡμῖν is certainly right in Mark, μεθ' ἡμῶν in Luke. But the Western text of Mark omits the ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει clause at the end of the verse, and inserts it, with ὅς for ὅτι, after ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια in the first half of the verse: so D W *fam* 1 *fam* 13 28 565 *a b c ff i k* vg arm. Both readings are combined in the Syrian text ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτὸν ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν. Quite clearly this last reading is conflate, and we have to choose between the other two, one of which is practically identical with Luke. For myself I feel no doubt at all that the Western reading is original in Mark, that Luke transferred the clause ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ to what seemed a more logical place for it at the end of the verse as the reason why the disciples 'forbade him', and that the Alexandrian reading represents an assimilation of the text of Mark to the more logical arrangement of the clauses in Luke. Read therefore in Mark εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν.

7. x 1 συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν. The word ὄχλος is found thirty-seven times in Mark, and this is the only occasion on which the plural occurs. When writing in the Journal for April 1925 (xxvi 237, 'Notes on Marcan usage: § V The movements of Jesus and

his disciples and the crowd') I tried to account for the exceptional use of the plural as perhaps emphasizing 'the numbers who collected from different directions on the journey through Peraea': but in fact there is no exception to account for. συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος is the reading of D Θ 565, συνπορεύεται ὁ ὄχλος of W, *conuenit turba* (with or without *rursus* or *iterum*) of *b c ff i k*,[1] 'there went again unto him a multitude' of syr-sin. Of the two verbs συνέρχομαι is found in two other places in St Mark (iii 20, xiv 53), συνπορεύομαι nowhere else in N.T. save in St Luke. The plural ὄχλοι is amply accounted for as an intrusion from the parallel in Matt. xix 2 ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί: and once more we follow the Westerns and Marcan usage with συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς αὐτόν.

8. x 2 καὶ [προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι] ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν. The words which W-H here enclose in brackets have again come in from Matt. xix 3 καὶ προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ Φαρισαῖοι: they are omitted by D *a b k* syr-sin, while *ff* has only *quidam*, and *i* is defective. See, for further discussion of the reading, my *Study of the New Testament: 1883 and 1920*, p. 60.

9. x 9 ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. So in identical words Matt. xix 6. But D *k* in Mark omit οὖν, and are borne out by Marcan usage. As I have shewn at length in a recent number of *J. T. S.* (xxviii 20, October 1926) οὖν is common in Matthew, extraordinarily rare in Mark. I have no doubt that it has been transferred from the passage of Matthew into the text of most authorities of the passage of Mark, and that we shall be right in following the two authorities which omit and in reading ὃ ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν . . .

10. x 19 ΜῊ ΦΟΝΕΎϹΗϹ, ΜῊ ΜΟΙΧΕΎϹΗϹ, ΜῊ ΚΛΈΨΗϹ. This order of the Commandments is the order of Matt. xix 18 and of the texts, Greek and Hebrew, of O.T., and is suspect for that very reason. Both the parallel text of Luke (xviii 20) and the catalogue in Mark vii 21 diverge, Luke only by inverting the Sixth and Seventh Commandments, Mark vii 21 by adding πορνεῖαι to μοιχεῖαι. When then we find that D *k* Iren. (for Iren. see *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei*, 1923, p. 251) agree in omitting μὴ φονεύσῃς and in adding μὴ πορνεύσῃς, the very unexpectedness of the reading gives it a claim for hearing. Mark's list is independent of the ordinary tradition—the presence of μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς further on is proof enough of that: the Vaticanus represents a forcible assimilation to Matthew or O.T., witness its ejection of the certainly genuine μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς. We shall therefore once more, if more tentatively than on other occasions, still award the preference to the reading of three good Western authorities μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ πορνεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς.[2]

---

[1] The text of *a* at this point cannot now be deciphered with certainty: but Bianchini read *turba ad illum* in the singular.

[2] For further discussion I may perhaps be allowed to refer to my Commentary on Mark *ad loc.* in the forthcoming S.P.C.K. Bible Commentary.

11. x 22 ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά with Matt. xix 22. But χρήματα is given for κτήματα in Mark by D *a b ff k*[1] syr-sin Clem. Al. *Quis diues saluetur* 4 § 7 (*b k* Clem. Al. add καὶ ἀγρούς, but I am not concerned with that addition at the moment): and it is rendered, I think, practically certain by *v.* 23, where the phrase is taken up again with οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες (so too Luke xviii 24). The ordinary texts have again been corrupted from Matthew: Mark used the same word χρήματα in both verses 22 and 23.

12. x 29 ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα . . . So B C W Δ Θ 565 syr-sin: and in the inverse order ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ℵ A with Matt. xix 29: ἢ μητέρα alone D *a ff k* (*def. i*). It seems to me all but certain that the latter reading is right. But it may be best to open the discussion by reducing the alternatives to two, and setting aside the reading ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα: if this had been original no one would have altered it, while its appearance in some MSS of Mark is amply accounted for either as the restitution of the common order 'father or mother', or as a direct transference from the parallel passage in Matt. xix 29. The issue lies really between the other two readings: and the considerations that seem to me decisive in favour of the Western reading are the following: (i) in all other points *v.* 30 is modelled on, and exactly reproduces, *v.* 29, 'home or brethren or sisters or mother [or father] or children or lands', 'homes and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and lands'—in *v.* 30 the evidence for 'and fathers' is wholly negligible: (ii) the order 'mother or father' seems unique in the Greek Bible, Old and New Testament alike: (iii) the omission of 'father' is no doubt at first sight odd, but may it not be that our Lord begins with His own case, which He transfers naturally enough to His followers—He had left 'home and brethren and sisters and mother': (iv) if 'mother' alone was original, and 'or father' was at a very early point added over the line, it would be an open chance whether the adventitious words were incorporated in the next copy before or after the 'or mother' of the evangelist's text. Read therefore ἢ μητέρα alone.

13. xi 31 Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ . . . So the critical texts with Matthew and Luke: but the Westerns D *a b c ff i k*, supported by the Easterns Θ Φ *fam* 13 28 565 700, prefix Τί εἴπωμεν; and that seems so entirely to correspond to the style of the Gospel that it is difficult not to believe it genuine. The other Synoptists may have independently suppressed the question as superfluous; or one or other of them may already have found it absent from his text of Mark. A line of nine letters Τί εἴπωμεν; might easily have dropped out if the scribe's eye wandered on to the next line ending with εἴπωμεν also.

---

[1] In spite of Tischendorf's note *ad loc.* it seems to me certain that *diuitias* of *k* represents χρήματα, not κτήματα: *diuitias* recurs in *v.* 23, where the Greek has χρήματα without variant. And he wrongly cites Clem. Al. for κτήματα.

14. xi 32 *ἅπαντες γὰρ εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάνην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν*. Matt. xxi 26 *πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάνην*, cf. xiv 5 *ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον*, xxi 46 *εἰς* [*v. l.* *ὡς*] *προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον*. Mark nowhere else uses *ἔχω* (fond as he is of the verb) in this sense: Matthew, as just quoted, does so twice. Thus there is proof that it is Matthaean use, none that it is Marcan: moreover Matthew's construction *ἔχειν ὡς* (or *εἰς*) *προφήτην*, 'reckon him for a prophet', is natural enough; not so Mark's *ἔχειν ὄντως*. But *εἰδέναι ὄντως*, 'to know of a truth', is as natural as *ἔχειν ὄντως* is the opposite: and D W Θ 565 *a b c ff i k* arm have *ᾔδεισαν τὸν Ἰωάνην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν*. That seems to me right: the rest, as so often, have borrowed from Matthew. I think too that Luke's *πεπεισμένος ἐστίν* (xx 6) is rather a paraphrase of *ᾔδεισαν ὄντως* than of *εἶχον ὄντως*.

15. xii 6 *ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτούς* with ℵ B C L Δ Θ *fam* 13 33: *πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔσχατον* A W vg etc.: *ἔσχατον* (without *πρὸς αὐτούς*) D 1071 *a ff i k*. Now if we look at the context we shall find that in *v.* 2 Mark has *πρὸς τοὺς γεωργούς* followed by Matthew and Luke: in *v.* 4 he has *πρὸς αὐτούς*, where both Matthew and Luke omit: in *v.* 5 (omitted by Matthew) Mark and Luke have nothing, and in *v.* 6 (the verse under discussion) Luke again has nothing. In other words Luke has *πρὸς* (*αὐτούς*) on the first occasion, but not again: Matthew has it on the first occasion, but not again till the last. Those are, from a literary point of view, both obvious and natural arrangements. Though there is less in Mark of conscious literary writing, I should like to give him the credit of the simple straightforwardness of *ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον*, which quite disappears if we prefer to read *αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτούς*. Add the considerations that *πρὸς αὐτούς* can be validly explained as a borrowing from Matthew, and that it is inserted in different places by different authorities, and I think the presumption in favour of the Westerns attains considerable proportions.

16. xii 14 *ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον . . .*; and similarly (without variant) n Matt. xxii 17. But in Mark *ἐπικεφάλαιον* (*capitularium*) is given in place of *κῆνσον* in D Θ 124 (one of the best representatives of *fam* 13) 565 1071 *k*: W has neither word in the text, but *κῆνσον* is written over Καίσαρι by perhaps the original scribe: *a b ff i* have *tributum*, but as and *ff* render *κῆνσον* by *censum* in Matt. xxii 17, it seems likely that hey did not read *κῆνσον* in Mark.[1] Decision is very difficult: for our natural instinct would be to treat the Latin word *κῆνσος* as one of Mark's many Latinisms, and moreover, though the Jews did pay a poll-ax to Caesar after A.D. 70, it does not seem that they did so at an arlier date: the taxes, whether direct or indirect, did not, apparently, include a poll-tax. I am not sure that I should feel justified in putting ἐπικεφάλαιον into the text, though I am quite sure that *capitularium* was the earliest Latin rendering of whatever word stood then in the Greek text of Mark used in Rome.

---

[1] It is true that Vulg. has *censum* in Matt., *tributum* in Mark, but St Jerome has robably just followed his Old Latin model.

17. xii 23 *ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή;* So both Matthew and Luke: and in Mark ℵ B C D L W Δ 28 33 and *c k*: a very strong combination, about the strongest combination anywhere in the Gospels in favour of a reading quite certainly wrong. But after ἀναστάσει the words ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν are added in A Θ *fam* 1 *fam* 13 565 and the mass of Greek MSS, *a b ff i* and Vulg. in Latin, syr-sin and arm. The presence of A and the mass of MSS on this side only means, of course, that the Syrian reviser found the words in one of his authorities, and so elected to retain them according to his regular preference—a preference no doubt usually wrong—for the longer reading. Apart from the Syrian text, however, we have one branch of the Western text, and the best authorities for the Eastern text, as against the Alexandrian text and D *k* of the Westerns: but we have also, what is decisive, the whole weight of Marcan usage. Cf. in xiii 19 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἣν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεός, xiii 20 διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο, and note that in both these cases Matthew (there are no strict parallels here in Luke) omits the second half of the phrase. We could have predicted with confidence that if Mark wrote ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν, the other Synoptists would have pruned away the redundancy, as they have in other cases too many to recapitulate. Further ground for admitting ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν into the text of Mark in *v.* 23 is supplied by the echo of the phrase in *v.* 25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, where Matthew and Luke, having both suppressed ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν above, both substitute the noun ἀνάστασις. That scribes invented the words in *v.* 23 is a far less reasonable proposition than that scribes omitted them under the influence of Matthew and Luke. And we are therefore face to face with the unwelcome conclusion that the agreement of the Alexandrians with the best Westerns is not necessarily right: see also no. **22** below.

18. xiii 2 οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ. So both the Alexandrian and the Eastern texts, and so with but small variation Matthew and Luke. But the whole Western group, D W *a b c e ff i k* Cyprian, add **καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν.** These words, whether genuine or no, are clearly not independent of xiv 58 ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω or (as the Westerns have it) ἀναστήσω. It is true that xiv 58 was the evidence of 'false witnesses', but it is clear from the evidence of the Gospels (cf. Acts vi 14) that our Lord *had* prophesied the destruction of the Temple; it is clear that the Jews believed that He had also spoken of its being raised or built again after an interval of 'three days', Mark xv 29; and it is clear that Christians too believed that He had used in connexion with His Death and Resurrection the phraseology 'after three days' or 'at an interval of three days' or 'on the third day'. Had He not only done this but brought both predictions, the destruction of the Temple and His own Resurrection, into juxtaposition with one another? It is not impossible, perhaps not even improbable: but it is another question whether St Mark had recorded such a double prediction at this point. If he had recorded it, it is not easy to see why both Matthew and Luke should have omitted it. That is the reason which inclines me on the whole to reject the words as an addition, though of course an early addition, to the text of Mark.

19. xiii 15 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω τι ἆραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ. So ℵ B L Ψ and the Sahidic: both Western and Eastern texts insert after καταβάτω the words εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, and the insertion was adopted by the Syrian revision, the authorities in support being A D W Θ etc *a ff i* syr-sin. Tischendorf wrongly cites *k* on the side of omission: it reads *et qui in tecto est non descendat auferre aliquit de domo*, and therefore omits not only εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν but μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω, obviously by *homoeoteleuton* whether in its ultimate Greek or in its proximate Latin ancestor (*descendat . . . introeat*), and there is so far nothing to shew whether it would have read εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν or no: it must, as far as that issue is concerned, be simply put aside. But the supposition that the words are genuine explains the phenomena much better than the converse: (i) the reduplication εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν . . . ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας is thoroughly Marcan, see on no. 17; (ii) it would again be in accord with Matthew's usage to omit one of the two synonymous οἰκία phrases—he gives only μὴ καταβάτω ἆραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ; (iii) omission of εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν may have been due either to partial assimilation to Matthew, or to the accidental omission of a line; (iv) μὴ καταβάτω as an independent sentence is really nonsense, for the man on the house-top is bound to 'come down', whether or no he goes into the house. On all grounds, then, read **μὴ καταβάτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω ἆραί τι (or τι ἆραι) ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ.**

20. xiii 22 ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα. So Matthew with the addition of μεγάλα after σημεῖα. But in Mark ψευδόχριστοι καί is omitted by D 124 (i.e. *fam* 13?) *i k*, and ποιήσουσιν is read for δώσουσιν by D Θ *fam* 13 28 565 *a*. About the latter variation it needs only to be said that ποιεῖν σημεῖον is so common a collocation that it is more likely to have been substituted for δοῦναι σημεῖον than *vice versa*. As to ψευδόχριστοι καί it is obvious that it might easily have been lost by *homoeoarcton*, and that may be the true explanation. Yet in the Apocalypse (xix 20) it is the 'false prophet who does signs . . . by which he deceived', and in Matt. xxiv 11 we find *πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐγερθήσονται καὶ πλανήσουσιν πολλούς*. That is probably an expansion of Matthew's own as a pendant to the 'many who shall come in my name, saying I am the Christ, and shall deceive many' of *v.* 5: and it suggests that Matt. had definitely in mind a parallelism between 'false Christs' and 'false prophets'. Note also that in *v.* 24 he has altered the *ἐγερθήσονται δέ* of Mark to *ἐγερθήσονται γάρ*. In other words, Mark is there passing on to a fresh point, Matthew is giving the reason for a point he has made already. Without dogmatizing in such a case I incline to think that in Mark *v.* 21 deals with false Christs, *v.* 22 only with false prophets, and that the Western group, small as it is, is right, while the rest have followed Matthew.

21. xiv 22–24 *καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου* . . . It will be noticed that the structure of the two halves of this account is not homogeneous, and comparison with Matt. xxvi 26–28 shews that in the Institution of the Bread the two Gospels are closely parallel, but that in the Institution of the Cup Mark has the statement of the fact that they drank instead of the command to drink. Now in *k*, though in no other authority, the two halves of the Marcan account are strictly homogeneous, and *v.* 22 is constructed on the same lines as *v.* 23: *accepit panem et benedixit et fregit et dedit illis et manducauerunt ex illo omnes et dixit illis Hoc est corpus meum*, or in Greek **λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔφαγον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.** That I believe to be what St Mark wrote. See my *Study of the New Testament, 1883 and 1920*, ed. 2 (1924) p. 70.

22. xiv 65 *καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ Προφήτευσον.* But D *a* syr-sin[1] read only *ἐμπτύειν τῷ προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν κτλ.*, and so Matt. xxvi 67 *ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν* . . . If Matthew had found the words *περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον* in the text of Mark, why in the world should he have omitted them? That consideration of course does not carry us all the way. If however we look at Luke xxii 64 we see at once the point of the veiling of the face, *καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες Προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;* But that can hardly be the meaning of *Προφήτευσον* in Mark, for there is no suggestion of the question 'Who is it that struck thee?' And I do not doubt that Wellhausen is right in seeing a reference to the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple (xiv 58, cf. xv 29), so that the meaning is simply 'Give us more prophecies': Luke, on the other hand, perhaps drawing on other sources, interpreted the 'Prophesy' in a different sense, and inserted the veiling to account for his interpretation. If that be so, omission by D *a* syr-sin (and Matthew) has strong claims to be regarded as original in Mark. Note, as in no. 17, the combination of Western and Eastern witnesses against the Alexandrians and *k*: I do not think we ever find *k* with Easterns against Alexandrians and European Westerns.

---

[1] Traces of the reading of D *a* syr-sin are found also in Θ 565 arm: see Dr Streeter's *Four Gospels*, p. 326.

23. xv 25 *ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν.* If these words are genuine we can only render them 'Now it was the third hour when they crucified him', since the fact of the Crucifixion has been already noted in *v.* 24. And it would cause us no surprise that Matthew and Luke, not being interested in notes of time, should omit the words. Only they do not simply omit them: both follow up the casting of lots over the clothes with a more or less equivalent notice, Matt. xxvii 36 *καὶ καθήμενοι ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ*, Luke xxiii 35*a* *καὶ ἱστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν.* But in all this part of the story Matthew is following Mark with quite extraordinary closeness: and so we should expect to find something here in Mark which accounts for Matthew—better still if we find something so put that it would account not only for the phrase of Matthew but also for the phrase of Luke. And in fact the Western text of Mark gives *ἐφύλασσον* in place of *ἐσταύρωσαν*: so D *ff k n r*[1] (W *a i* being all three defective here): and *ἐφύλασσον* would quite easily suggest the *ἐτήρουν* of Matthew.[2] *τηρεῖν* is a favourite word with Matthew in this part of his Gospel (see xxvii 54, xxviii 4), and he has probably substituted it for the vaguer word *φυλάσσειν.* But he has correctly interpreted the sense of Mark if *ἐφύλασσον* was what Mark wrote: if *ἐσταύρωσαν* is right in Mark, Matthew has introduced a new idea. It is not so easy to be sure that Luke is really parallel to Mark at this point: but it is at least possible that he interpreted *ἐφύλασσον* as an impersonal plural 'people were watching him' in the sense of 'looking on at him', and cleared up any ambiguity by inserting *ὁ λαός* as the subject of the sentence. Anyhow the evidence of Matthew is in my belief sufficient to make it probable that he found *ἐφύλασσον* in the text of Mark, and I should therefore read ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐφύλασσον αὐτόν.

---

[1] *n* is the symbol for some St Gall leaves of the fifth or sixth century, the text being very close to that of *a*, edited by White in *Old Latin Biblical Texts* II, 1886: *r* is a Gospel MS of the sixth century preserved at Dublin and edited by T. K. Abbott *Evangeliorum Versio Antehieronymiana*, 2 vols., Dublin, 1884.

[2] So Tischendorf *ad loc.* on *ἐφύλασσον* (though he does not give it in his text), 'quae lectio egregie commendatur conlato Mt xxvii 36'.

24. xv 34 *a* Ἐλωί ἐλωί λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί; But it is very difficult to think that this can represent the words used by our Lord, for how could the form Ἐλωί possibly have been confused with anything like Ἠλείας? Ἠλί (Ἠλεί), that is to say, the Hebrew form not the Aramaic, must certainly be original, and it is in itself much more likely that our Lord in His dying cry from the Psalm would have used the sacred language rather than any Aramaic rendering. Now the Hebrew form is actually given here by D Θ 131 (that is *fam* 1) 565 *c i k n* arm and Eusebius (*demonstratio evangelica* x 8, citing Mark by name), and I cannot hesitate for a moment in restoring to Mark the words Ἠλεί Ἠλεί λαμὰ ζαφθανεί; With our larger knowledge of the Synoptic problem it is, if one of the two Gospels gave a Hebrew and one an Aramaic wording, much the more probable that it was Mark who gave the original, Matthew the altered and more generally intelligible, form.

25. xv 34 *b* εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με; So all authorities, save one Greek and three Latin MSS. But D has ὠνείδισάς με, *k* has *maledixisti me*,[1] *i* has *me in opprobrium dedisti*, *c* has *exprobrasti me*: it is quite impossible that any scribe should have invented this reading, while the ordinary text is amply accounted by the combined influence of the LXX of Ps. xxi (xxii) 1 and Matt. xxvii 46. Read therefore εἰς τί ὠνείδισάς με;

26. xv 39 ἰδὼν δὲ . . . ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν. A very complicated case: and presumably Matthew and Luke either found some difficulty in the text of Mark, or else regarded it as mere reduplication of *v.* 37 ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν, for the former has ἰδόντες . . . τὰ γινόμενα, the latter ἰδὼν . . . τὸ γενόμενον. οὕτως, though omitted by W Θ 565 syr-sin arm, is given by both the Alexandrian and the Western texts, ℵ A B C D L *c ff i k n*, and must surely be genuine. But for the ἐξέπνευσεν of ℵ B L, ἔκραξεν alone is represented by *k*, κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν by A C (D) W Θ 565 syr-sin arm and all Old Latins but *k*. The latter reading looks like a combination of the other two, and I am not sure that οὕτως ἔκραξεν (*sic exclamauit*[2]) of *k* does not best explain the genesis of the alternatives. In the first place κράζω has very strong

---

[1] We owe to Prof. Burkitt the detection of the original reading of *k*. It may be noted here that *maledicere* is used in the *Actus Petri cum Simone*, ed. Lipsius 61. 14, 71. 18 (and probably 55. 23, where the MS gives *malo dixit*), with the meaning 'bitterly reproach' rather than 'curse', and the Greek verb of the original was very likely ὀνειδίζειν.

[2] It did occur to me to wonder whether *exclamauit* could be a rendering of the simple verb ἔκραξεν, and whether, in the ancestor of *k*, *clamans* could have been added by a correcting hand over *exspirauit*, and that the scribe of the copy took the addition as a substitution and so produced *exclamauit*. But in fact κράζω is represented in *k* by *exclamo* (Mark ix 24, Matt. xv 22) and by *adclamo* (Mark xv 13, 14) as well as by *clamo* (Mark ix 26, x 47, 48, xi 9, Matt. viii 29, ix 27, xv 23); and so far as there are shades of difference between the three alternatives, *exclamare* is here (in Mark xv 39) the most appropriate.

support—all authorities in fact except ℵ B L: in the second place it was in all probability from Mark xv 39 that Matthew derived *κράξας* in xxvii 50 *κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*: in the third place *κράζω* is not used of our Lord anywhere else in the Synoptic Gospels (though three times in the Fourth Gospel), and it is exactly the sort of indication of violent emotion that Alexandrian critics would have liked to modify. I conclude that it belongs to the genuine text of Mark, and we have to choose between οὕτως ἔκραξεν and οὕτως κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν. I should like to add a further argument, though to some readers it will perhaps seem an over subtle one. What was it that moved the centurion to the particular conclusion that He who had so cried out at the moment of death was 'a son of God'? It is (is it not?) a question that calls imperatively for answer: and I cannot help thinking that St Luke gives the key to the solution. Mark's informant heard the cry, for it was loud, but was too far off to hear what the words of the cry were: Luke tells us that it was 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit'. If the centurion had asked of some one near him what the (Hebrew) words meant, and learnt that Jesus died with the confident appeal to God as Father on His lips, then the conclusion that this was in truth 'a son of God' becomes at last intelligible.

27. xv 43 *ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. But D *k* have *πτῶμα* (*cadauer*); just as in xv 45 ℵ B D L 565 have *ἐδωρήσατο τὸ πτῶμα τῷ Ἰωσήφ*, the rest *σῶμα* (with *k corpus*). I cannot suppose that Mark meant to distinguish more respectful language of Joseph from more contemptuous language of Pilate: he is too artless a writer for such refinements. He used, I think, in both cases *πτῶμα* of the Lord's dead body, but we cannot wonder that Matthew and Luke in their parallels to *v.* 43 (both omit in *v.* 45) have substituted *σῶμα*, or that most MSS of Mark have followed them: D is in fact the only witness that gives *πτῶμα* in both cases, but I believe it to be right, and would read here ᾐτήσατο τὸ πτῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

28. xvi 1 *καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου ἡ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα* . . . The names here are omitted by D *k n*, that is (since *n* is equivalent to *a*) by our three best Western authorities; *a b i* are defective. And omission appears to be right; if the ordinary text had lain before Matthew and Luke, why does neither of them make any mention of Salome in the Resurrection narrative? Moreover the text of Mark becomes more intelligible if we read xv 47, xvi 1 continuously with only one mention of names, ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσῆτος ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται· καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου [πορευθεῖσαι[1]] ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν. What then was the genesis of the ordinary text? As so often, it is due to the influence of the text of Matthew: Matthew mentions the women at three points, xxvii 56 repeated from Mark xv 40, xxvii 61 repeated from Mark xv 47, and, *because he has here interpolated the story of the sealing of the tomb*, the names of xxvii 61 are repeated in xxviii 1. Because Matthew had the names three times, Mark must have them three times also, though in Mark there is no interval. And the interpolators, with the fondness of interpolators for fullness, make, as it happens, the insertion not of the two names of Matt. xxviii 1 but of the three of Matt. xxvii 56 = Mark xv 40.

---

[1] It is true that *πορεύομαι* is not a Marcan word, though *παραπορεύομαι* (ii 23, ix 30, xi 20, xv 29) is fairly common. But *ἐλθοῦσαι* of the critical texts is suspect,

Here then are twenty-eight Western readings from the second half of the Gospel, selected more or less by chance, though it is hoped that a good many of the most important variants between the Alexandrian and the Western texts are included. In something like two-thirds of them I should myself judge the Western variation to represent more or less certainly what the evangelist wrote: in nos. **2**, **3**, **5**, **10**, **20**, **21**, **26**, **28** I should not put it higher than that the Western reading has the better claim of the two: in **16** and **18** the issue is doubtful—the balance may even incline the other way. But if these conclusions are anywhere near the mark, it is abundantly clear that the accepted results of the textual criticism of the Gospels need to be re-opened and re-examined. And, with that aim in view, some further precision both as to the causes which account for the depravation of the Marcan original in the Alexandrian tradition (reproduced in our critical texts), and also as to what seems *prima facie* to be the relative value in the cases before us of the different authorities or groups of authorities on the 'Western' side, will not be out of place.

(i) *Causes of the errors of the Alexandrian tradition in all or most of the readings discussed.*

a. By far the most common cause of error is assimilation to the text of one or both of the other two Synoptists. All authorities or groups of authorities for St Mark's Gospel succumb in varying degrees and on different occasions to this temptation. The Alexandrian text of Mark would seem to shew examples of this, by assimilation to Matthew, in **7**, **8**, **9**, (**10**), **11**, (**12**), **14**, **15**, (**19**), **20**, **21**, **24**, **25**, (**28**); by assimilation to Luke, in **2**, **3**, **6**, **22**[1]; by assimilation to both, in **13**, **17**, **27**; altogether

---

for often as Mark employs ἔρχομαι, this is the one passage (if we except v 26 εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα, 'went from bad to worse', and that is not literal but metaphorical) where we must translate not 'come' but 'go'. In any case the reading πορευθεῖσαι is not necessarily bound up with the omission of the names: Θ 565 have the names and yet have πορευθεῖσαι as well as ἐλθοῦσαι.

[1] And conceivably also **23**: if the ἐσταύρωσαν of all save the Western texts needs

in twenty-one cases out of twenty-eight, just three-fourths of the total number, though in one or two cases there may be alternative or contributory causes.

β. Another *vera causa* of Alexandrian corruption of the text of Mark is the desire to remove the imperfections or non-literary elements of Mark's Greek. This accounts for 1, 4, and probably 5.

γ. A third criterion of variants in the tradition of Mark's text is evidence of Marcan usage. Mark's fondness for tautological expressions suggests that the fuller text is right in 17 and 19.

These three causes, then, account between them for twenty-four out of the twenty-eight variations discussed above. There remain only 16, 18, 23, 26. In the first two of these decision is difficult, and the Western reading is perhaps probably wrong. In 23 internal evidence and the parallel in Matthew appear to me to be decisive: in 26 I believe the Alexandrians to be wrong, but there remain two Western readings between which we have to decide.

(ii) *The relative value of different authorities supporting the Western readings.*

a. In more than half the readings discussed there is some evidence from Eastern witnesses—witnesses, that is, which give us the ancient text, as it seems, of Antioch or Caesarea, especially Θ 565 and the Sinai Syriac, less often *fam* 1 *fam* 13 and 28—in support of strictly Western texts: namely in 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, (11), 13, 14, (15), 16, 17, 19, (20), 22, 24, 26. But, important as their evidence is, it does not in my judgement amount to being decisive. A reading unsupported by them is not necessarily wrong. The Western and the Alexandrian texts are primary: each of them may be right against all the rest. I doubt if the Eastern texts are ever, I am sure they are not often, right against the Western and Alexandrian texts combined. Their value comes in in cases where the Western texts are divided: in 3, 17, 22 I accept readings where D and European Latins (in 22 only D *a*) are supported respectively by Θ *fam* 13 565, by Θ *fam* 1 *fam* 13 565, and by syr-sin, against ℵ B *k*.

β. Better than any other witness apart from ℵ B is *k*. It gives the Western reading in all our twenty-eight cases except 3, 17, 22.[1] It is in my judgement right alone in 21 and perhaps in 26: probably right with W only in 2: right with D only in 9, 27, with D Iren. in 10, with D *n* (that is, presumably *a*) in 28, with D *c i* in 25: right with *c* only in 1. But perhaps the most striking result of our enquiry is that even

any other explanation than the mis-directed intelligence of scribes, it may have arisen out of a marginal jotting due to Luke xxiii 33.

[1] In 19 *k* has an omission by *homoeoteleuton* which removes its ultimate evidence from consideration.

the combination ℵ B *k* is not necessarily right: **3**, **17**, **22** seem to shew that the 'African'[1] and Alexandrian texts may, on some rare occasions, agree in error against what one may call provisionally the texts of Rome and Antioch. It is difficult to construct a history of text-development which will account satisfactorily for this phenomenon: but there it is.

γ. Of the other Latins *a* and *i* are definitely the best.

δ. Always the most puzzling problem is the text of D. Not counting the two readings, **16**, **18**, where the whole Western group, D *k* included, is perhaps wrong, it gives all the readings here recommended except **1**, **2**, **17**, **21**, **26**: of these **21** and **26** are singular readings of *k*, and **2** of *k* W, and in **17** *k* is wrong as well as D. No account has, however, been taken of any singular readings of D. And we do not therefore get further than that D, however erratic on occasion, contains a very valuable text.

These results are based on too small a number of instances to be more than provisional. But I think they are important in their implications.

C. H. TURNER.

DID CODEX VERCELLENSIS (*a*) CONTAIN THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF ST MARK?

SOME doubt must naturally hang over the problem of the earliest Western text of the ending of St Mark's Gospel: for three of our authorities, *b e* and *i*, are defective at that point, and the rest are divided, *k* having the Shorter Ending only, while D and *ff* contain enough of the Longer Ending to shew that when complete they contained the whole of it. And since Irenaeus also bears witness to the Longer Ending, it may be concluded that the Church of Gaul at any rate had it in its Gospel text from the first. Thus Gaul and Africa are set against one another: but we have so far no evidence as to Italy. The object of the present note is to examine the evidence of the oldest and best of our Italian Old Latin MSS, codex *a*, the Vercelli Gospels.

Now the St Gall fragments known as *n* are admitted to stand in very close relation textually to *a*: and they contain verses 9 to 13 of Mark xvi on the last leaf extant (*Old Latin Biblical Texts* ii p. 72). There was therefore some presumption to start with that *a* also once contained the Longer Ending.

---

[1] I have myself always supposed that the 'African' text came from Rome. I only call it 'African' because St Cyprian's evidence shews that it was the text of Carthage in A. D. 250.

That presumption, however, does not seem to me to square with the deductions that can fairly be drawn from the phenomena presented by codex *a* itself. What are the facts?

The latest edition of *a* is in vol. iii of the Benedictine *Collectanea Biblica Latina* (Rome, 1914).[1] St Mark, in the usual Western order, comes last, beginning on q. xxxiiii fol. 7 *a* and ending (so far as the original text is concerned) with q. xxxxi fol. 8 *b* at the words 'Pilatus autem', Mark xv 15. After this point four leaves have been cut out, and then follows a single leaf containing Mark xvi 7 (from the word 'galileam') to 20 in a later hand and according to the Vulgate text. Quite obviously the original scribe of *a* cannot have used the text of St Jerome, whose Vulgate is of later date than *a*. But the later scribe begins his Vulgate leaf not at xvi 8 but a little higher up at 'galileam' in *v*. 7. Why? I can see no other explanation than that he began there because a leaf of the original codex had begun there, and that he wanted to replace it, and so began where it began.

But, granted this, it may be answered that this last leaf of the original codex had been lost, as last leaves often are, and that, while the second scribe naturally replaced it with the Vulgate text when he wanted to make his Gospel text complete, there is so far nothing to shew that the original scribe may not have concluded the Gospel with an Old-Latin text of the Longer Ending, such as we have in *n*.

It is here that I want to submit an argument that, so far as I know, has not been brought into the discussion before. Four leaves have been cut out, representing the text from Mark xv 15 onwards. Calculation will shew that if 'galileam' commenced a leaf, it can only have been the fourth leaf: xv 15–xvi 7 represents roughly the material of three leaves of *a*.[2] Now if the fourth and last leaf of the original codex began with 'galileam', it is not likely that it can have contained the Longer Ending: for xvi 7–20 can hardly have been written within the limits of a single leaf. If, as with St Luke's Gospel in *a*, there was a subscription added at the end, the case is clearer still. Moreover the last page or at least the last column of a Gospel book would probably have been left blank. All goes to shew that the single leaf which once began with 'galileam' and has now disappeared cannot have sufficed for the Longer Ending, unless both very drastic methods of compression were employed in the text itself, and also there was a complete absence of colophon or subscription.

---

[1] On p. xiii of the Introduction the editor writes that 'it is not quite clear how the smaller gatherings [in St Matthew] were counted in': but a reference to the extremely useful table on p. xxi suggests to me a very simple explanation, namely, that in both the gatherings vii and x the first two and last two leaves of the quaternion had in some way got inverted, and when the confusion was put right the wrongly placed conjugate leaves were not rearranged as part of the quaternion, but were just cut in two and each put separately in its proper place.

[2] It is in fact slightly over the average; three leaves of *a* should be about equivalent to 70 or 71 lines of Westcott and Hort's small edition, and there are here 74: but one line of W-H was no doubt omitted, with D *k n*, in Mark xvi 1. On the other hand xvi 8–20 takes up 26 lines of the same edition.

It may of course be asked why four leaves were cut out, when it was only the last which needed cancelling. Perhaps the original intention was to preserve the first three, and bind them up again with the new fourth leaf: perhaps the instructions for removing the last leaf were misunderstood as being instructions for removing the last gathering. But whatever answer we may give to this question, the reasons for supposing that there was a definite intention to replace a last leaf which did not contain the Twelve Verses with a leaf[1] which copied verses 7 *b*, 8 from the cancelled leaf and verses 9–20 from the Vulgate do not seem to be affected. *a* in fact must have had either the Shorter Ending or none at all.

C. H. TURNER.

THE MICHIGAN FRAGMENT OF THE ACTS.

THESE remarks occurred to me after I had read Prof. H. A. Sanders' paper upon 'A Papyrus fragment of Acts in the Michigan Collection', reprinted from the *Harvard Theological Review*, vol. xx no. 1, Jan. 1927.[2] I had no other object in writing them except to clarify my own impressions, but several friends have suggested to me that they might be worth printing, and after some hesitation I have complied with their request. My hesitation was due to the fact that I have for a long time been engaged upon a critical edition of the Acts based upon *codex Bezae* (*D*) and its allies, in which I have ventured to make certain modifications in the traditional *sigla*. The reasons for so doing will be set out in my edition, which I hope before long to offer to the Press. I did not like to desert my *sigla* on this occasion, but I fear that some readers may object to them as unfamiliar. I therefore add a brief explanation of them. I denote the Greek MSS in general as Γ (δ = minn. 383, 614), and use *Z* as a general sign for *D* and its various allies, Greek, Latin, and Syriac. I use Λ to denote old Latin MSS, e. g. Λ^d = the Latin side of *D*, A^{g} = Gigas, A^{h} = Floriacensis, A^{p} = Perp. So also in references to Evv. I use A^{e} and A^{k} for the MSS generally called *e* and *k*. I refer occasionally to two Vulgate MSS, which in the Acts contain a number of *Z* readings, viz. the book of Armagh and the Wernigerodensis of Blass, as vg^{a} and vg^{w} respectively. Controversy rages around the Syriac text and marginalia printed by J. White in 1799. I can only say that I accept in its plain sense the colophon of Thomas of Harkel—who states that he took the marginalia from a Greek MS belonging to the Enaton near Alexandria—and I refer to his MS as *codex Thomae*. I regard the text to which they are appended as Philoxenian, also on the evidence of the colophon, and call it $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$. I denote the agreement of $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{vg}$ (= Peschitta) by $\mathfrak{S}$.

---

[1] The new leaf is written in much longer lines than the original scribe of *a* had used (17 letters to the line or so instead of about 10), and so the matter of the Longer Ending is easily got into one complete page, and one column of the second page, of a single leaf.

[2] I have to thank Prof. Sanders for his great kindness in sending me a copy of his article.

A number of references will be found in this paper to the arrangement by *στίχοι* in *D*, since this throws great light upon the history of the text. This is a subject upon which I have touched in chh. xi and xii of a previous work, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford, 1914).

The discovery of the new papyrus, which contains Acts xviii 27–xix 6 and xix 12–16 can only be described as sensational. Recent critics have been extremely unwilling to credit the statement of Thomas that his marginalia were drawn from a Greek MS, arguing on *a priori* grounds that such a MS was not likely to be found in Egypt. Their ingenious hypotheses are upset by the appearance of the papyrus which shews that a Greek text of the *Z* type was in use in Egypt, as elsewhere, at a very early date.

Sanders is of opinion that the papyrus was written between A.D. 200 and 250. It is only fair to mention that others have ascribed to it a somewhat later date, viz. cent. iv. This is a question which must be decided by papyrological experts. The papyrus may safely be regarded as prior to our oldest Greek MSS ℵ and *B*.

The chief affinities of 𝔓 are with *D* and *c. Thom.* Unfortunately Thomas gives only three quotations from the verses in question, so the evidence is incomplete so far as his MS is concerned. The silence of Thomas, of course, proves nothing, since his collation was very imperfect.

Sanders is at pains to ascertain the relation of 𝔓 to the other MSS, especially to *D* and *c. Thom.*, and collates it with *D* throughout (pp. 11–12). He then employs a method which has been used by many critics, notably by H. Meusel in his treatise upon the chief authorities for Cicero's *Verrines* iv and v, viz. the Vatican palimpsest (*V*) and Paris. 7774 (*R*). This is to put together in one table all variants, not distinguishing between those of real importance and trivial errors which prove nothing: to add up the results, and to operate with the figures thus obtained. Peterson in his preface to the *Verrines* (p. xiii) says of Meusel:

> dum litterarum, syllabarum, verborum permutationes, additiones, omissiones quasi in trutina expendit, rem nimis ad calculos videtur revocasse.

Sanders thus discovers 'perfect agreement' between 𝔓 and *c. Thom.* against *D* four times (p. 12), and later on says that these agreements prove Ropes's contention that *c. Thom.* is regularly right against *D*. I shall have something to say shortly about these supposed agreements, but before doing so I venture to rearrange the evidence according to another method.

(A) I take first the passages in which we have the evidence of *c. Thom.* as well as that of *D* and 𝔓.

xix 1 *D* has:

Θελοντος δε του παυλου
κατα την ιδιαν βουλην
πορευεσθαι εις ιεροσολυμα
ειπεν αυτω το πν̄α υποστρεφειν εις την ασιᾱ
5 *διελθων δε τα ανωτερικα μερη*
ερχεται εις εφεσον.

C. Thom. agrees exactly with *D*, except that in *στ.* 4 it gives *converte te* for *ὑποστρέφειν*. This may be a Syriacism, so I do not take it into account.

𝔓, as supplemented by Sanders, has:—

Θελοντ[ος δε]
[του π]αυλου κατα τη[ν ιδιαν βου]λη[ν πορευ]
[εσθα]ι εις ιεροσολυμα [ειπεν αυτω] το [πν̄α]
[υποστρ]εφειν εις τ̣[ην ασιαν διελθων δε τα]
[ανωτ]ερικα μερ[η ε]ρχετα[ι εις εφεσον[κ̣α̣ι̣]

It will be noticed that with *D* it gives *ὑποστρέφειν*. In l. 1 *Θελονι* is a trivial error for *Θελοντ*.

Γ, *cett.* give:—

ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπόλλω εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ Παῦλον διελθόντα τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἔφεσον.

Here a tame abbreviation has taken the place of *στ.* 1–4, with a consequential change of *διελθών* to *διελθόντα*.

v. 2 *D* has:—

οι δε προς αυτον αλλ ουδε πν̄α αγιον λαμβανουσιν τινες ηκουσαμεν.

Here *οὐδέ* is a scribal error for *οὐδ' εἰ*.

c. Thom. has (sed neque si) accipiant aliqui (spiritum sanctum).

𝔓 has:

[αλλ ου]δ ει πνα αγιον λαμβαν[ουσιν τι]νες η
[κουσα]μεν

Sah. gives 'We heard not even that any one is wont to receive holy *spirit*' (Horner).

Γ. *cett.* have: ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐστιν ἠκούσαμεν.

v. 14 *D* has:—

εν οις και υιοι σκευα τινος ιερεως
ηθελησαν το αυτο ποιησαι
εθος ειχαν τους τοιουτους εξορκιζειν
και εισελθοντες προς τον δαιμονιζομενō
5 ηρξαντο επικαλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες
παραγγελλομεν σοι εν ι̅η̅υ̅
ον παυλος εξελθειν κηρυσσει
τοτε απεκριθη το πν̄α το πονηρον ειπεν αυτοις.

In στ. 7 ἐξελθεῖν κηρύσσει is a scribal error for κηρ. ἐξ. Such inversions are common in all MSS, and *D* has other instances in the Acts.

The quotation from *c. Thom.* is as follows. I employ White's Latin, but for purposes of comparison arrange it in στίχοι like those of *D*.

in quibus filii septem Scevae cuiusdam sacerdotis
qui voluerunt id ipsum facere
qui soliti erant adiurare super eos qui tales.
et cum ingressi erant ad demoniacum
5 coeperunt invocare nomen dicentes
praecipimus tibi per Iesum
quem Paulus praedicat exeas.
respondens autem spiritus ille malus dixit.

Sanders gives the reading of 𝔓 as follows:—

εν οις και υ[ιοι]
ϊο̣[υ]δ̣αιου τινο̣ς αρχιερεως ηθ̣[ελη]
σα̣ν[το α]υτο ποιησαι εθος εχοντες [εξορκι]
ζειν τ̣ους τοιουτους και εισελθο[ντες]
5 προς δαιμονιζομενον ηρξ[αντο επι]
καλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες π̣[αραγγελ]
λομεν σοι εν ι̅η̅υ̅ ον Παυλος ο [αποστο]
λος κηρυσσει εξε̣λ̣θειν απο[κριθεν]
δε το̣ πν̄α το πονηρ̣ο̣[ν ειπεν αυτοις]

The reading of l. 2 is very uncertain. Sanders says that 'iota with the diaeresis is sure, and also omicron, of which one half is preserved'. He thinks that there was 'either a small place in the papyrus on which the scribe could not write, or else an error immediately crossed out, which took the space of two letters'. It is hard to believe that the papyrus did not contain Σκευᾶ with all other MSS, while ἑπτά, possibly in the form ζ', may have come after *υἱοί*, as in *c. Thom.* In l. 5 the omission of *τόν* after *πρός* is a *proprius error* of no importance. There are some minor points which I reserve for the moment, so as not to confuse the argument.

Γ, *cett.* give:—

ἦσαν δέ τινος Σκευᾶ Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως ἑπτὰ υἱοὶ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες· ἀποκριθὲν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

They omit all the extra matter furnished by *D*, *c. Thom.*, 𝔓 (ἔθος . . . κηρύσσει), which occupies five στίχοι in *D*. At the beginning of the verse there are two notorious cruces in the reading of Γ, viz. the sons of Sceva are said to be seven in number, while in *v.* 16 ἀμφοτέρων is used of them, and Sceva is called a high priest, ἀρχιερεύς. It is impossible to explain the presence of a Jewish High-Priest at Ephesus. On the other hand the reading of *D* is free from all difficulties. The number of Sceva's sons is not stated, but it is to be inferred from ἀμφοτέρων.

The reading of *c. Thom.* has been given above. It will be seen that it agrees with Γ in reading ἑπτά and with *D* in reading ἱερέως. That this is so is clear, since in the lemma, taken from $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$, White gives *principis sacerdotum* and in the quotation of Thomas *sacerdotis*. *D* and *c. Thom.*, therefore, agree in this most important variant. It is somewhat singular that Sanders on p. 12 assigns ἀρχιερέως to 'all' MSS except *D*, and on p. 16 definitely ascribes ἀρχιερέως to *c. Thom.* On p. 17 he also says: 'We may disregard the variant ἱερέως of cod. Bezae, as it is due to the influence of the Latin parallel *sacerdotis*'. That this is not so, is clear from its occurrence in the Syriac as well as in *D*.

The theory that ἱερέως in *D* is due to *sacerdotis* in the Latin (Λ^d) was started by Zahn and adopted by Ropes, while Sanders states it as a fact. It is, therefore, well to point out that it is groundless.

It is indeed true that ἀρχιερεύς is sometimes rendered by *sacerdos* in Latin. Thus *sacerdos* occurs four times in Λ^k of Evv., viz. Matt. ii 4: Mark xiv 47: xv 11, 31. As against this, Λ^k has seventeen examples of *pontifex*, all in Mark, and one of *princeps* (without *sacerdotum*) in Mark xv 10. *Sacerdos* as = 'high-priest' or 'bishop' occurs not infrequently in Cyprian (so also *magnus sacerdos*), who used a text resembling that of Λ^k. In the Palatinus (Λ^e), a MS which has traces of affinity with Λ^k, there are six examples of *sacerdos*, as against sixteen of *princeps sacerdotum* (+two of *principes et sacerdotes*), and eleven of *pontifex*. Apart from these cases, the use of *sacerdos* (= ἀρχιερεύς) is rare both in MSS and authors. The consecrated renderings are *princeps sacerdotum*, *pontifex* and *summus sacerdos*.

The renderings in Λ^d are as follows:—

princeps sacerdotum	**Evv. 38 exx. : A. none**
princeps sacerdos	**Evv. 3 exx. : A. none**
summus sacerdos	**Evv. 18 exx. (all in Mark) : A. none**
pontifex	**Evv. none : A. 7 exx. (also iv 6 pontificalis = ἀρχιερατικός).**

Sacerdos, without *summus*, is not found in Λ^d except in the sense of ἱερεύς. Zahn's theory therefore is perverse. *Sacerdotis* in Λ^d does not stand for ἀρχιερέως; for this purpose *pontificis* would have been used. It is the normal rendering of ἱερέως in the Greek.

Before going further, I would state what I conceive to be the natural interpretation of these facts. This is that *D* preserves the *Z* reading in its pure form, while *c. Thom.* which otherwise agrees with it, viz. in giving ἐν οἷς for ἦσαν δε (Γ), in omitting Ἰουδαίου (Γ), in reading ἱερέως for ἀρχιερέως (Γ), has incorporated in its text a single variant from Γ, viz. ἑπτά. I have elsewhere suggested[1] that ἑπτά owes its origin to a marginal note ζη, or ζτ (= ζήτει), indicating a corruption in the text—viz. the mention of a high priest at Ephesus—which was subsequently confused with ζ (= ἑπτά).

I now come to the papyrus. In the first place it has ἐν οἷς with *D*, *c. Thom.* In the next line, if Sanders' reconstruction is correct, whicl must be considered doubtful, it omits both ἑπτά with *D sol.* and Σκευᾶ which is found in all other MSS, and in place of them has Ἰουδαίου with Γ (*om. D*, *c. Thom.*). His view is that Ἰουδαίου was the original reading, and that Σκευᾶ 'came in as a gloss to Ἰουδαίου, supplanting the latter in cod. Bezae and its relatives but uniting with it elsewhere'. To this I reply that Σκευᾶ cannot be a gloss. It supplies necessary information. On the other hand Ἰουδαίου looks extremely like a gloss of the most ordinary kind, drawn from the context, viz. τῶν περιερχομένων Ἰουδαίων ἐξορκιστῶν in the previous verse. If, therefore, the papyrus really has Ἰουδαίου, it has incorporated a gloss from Γ, against *c. Thom.* as well as *D*. I say no more, since the reading of 𝔓 is so doubtful. On the other hand ἀρχιερέως with Γ, against *D*, *c. Thom.* is certainly the reading of 𝔓. I have already given my view of this variant.

In the sentence which follows, viz. ἔθος . . . ἐξελθεῖν, we are entirely dependent in *D*, *c. Thom.*, 𝔓, as the whole passage is omitted by Γ, *cett.* The most important variant in 𝔓 is the addition of ο[αποστο]λος after Παῦλος, where Sanders' supplement seems certain. It has, however, all the appearance of a gloss, and does not enhance the authority of 𝔓.

---

[1] *Descent of MSS* p. 450 (Oxford, 1918).

Sanders finds in 𝔓 four examples of what he calls 'perfect agreement' (p. 12) between 𝔓 and *c. Thom.* against *D*. Of these three occur in this sentence. One of them seems certain, viz. ἐξορκίζειν τοὺς τοιούτους 𝔓 as against τοὺς τοιούτους ἐξορκίζειν in *D*. White gives as the reading of *c. Thom.*, *adiurare super eos qui tales*. This, therefore, may be granted, though it is not an important variant. Another is not so certain, viz. for ἔθος εἶχαν (*D*) 𝔓 has ἔθος ἔχοντες. White renders the reading of *c. Thom.* as *qui soliti erant*, and Sanders says that this equals ἔθος ἔχοντες. It might, however, represent οἳ ἔθος εἶχον, or, in view of the fact that in the same sentence White gives *qui voluerunt* for ἠθέλησαν, might stand for ἔθος εἶχον with *D*. The third example is one which is quite valueless, viz. the inversion of κηρύσσει and ἐξελθεῖν in *D*, which is a *proprius error* and makes nonsense.

Sanders' fourth example is taken from *v.* 15, where we have the evidence of Γ as well as *c. Thom.* *D* here has :—τοτε απεκριθη το πν̄α το πονηρον ειπεν αυτοις. Γ gives ἀποκριθὲν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Here *D* shews signs of conflation with Γ, i. e. καί was struck out before εἶπεν, as if ἀποκριθέν had preceded. The reading of *c. Thom.*, as given by White, coincides with that of Γ. It will be seen from the transcript that the papyrus is somewhat defective. It certainly has not got τότε, and it is very probable that Sanders' supplements are correct, in which case 𝔓 = *c. Thom.*, Γ. This, however, is a different case from those previously treated, owing to the entry of Γ into the problem. Generally speaking, when one member of *Z* has a reading agreeing with Γ, while another has one which disagrees with Γ, it is held that the agreement has been brought about by conflation with Γ. I am inclined to believe that there were two variants, viz. τότε ἀπεκρίθη . . . καὶ εἶπεν (*Z*) and ἀποκριθὲν δέ . . . εἶπεν (Γ). This then is a case where *c. Thom.* and 𝔓 have been corrected from Γ.

The only clear case, therefore, which I can find of 'perfect agreement' between 𝔓 and *c. Thom.* is the variant in collocation (ἐξορκίζειν τοὺς τοιούτους). I regard with some doubt that of ἔθος ἔχοντες. The other two seem to me beside the point.

(B) I now come to the portions of the papyrus for which no readings of *c. Thom.* are quoted. Here also I shall mention first the points which appear to be important.

(*a*) Agreements of 𝔓 with *D*, or *D* + other representatives of *Z*.

xviii 27 εἰς τὴν 'Αχαΐαν *D*, δ, Λ^{g}, $\mathfrak{S}^{ph}$: [. . .]θε̣ι̣ν αχαϊα 𝔓 (?) : *om.* Γ, *cett.* Aug.

πολὺ συνεβάλλετο *D*, Λ^{g}, 𝔓, *Aug.* : συνεβ. πολύ Γ, *cett.* ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις *D* : *om.* Γ, *cett.* The papyrus is here very defective, but Sanders seems right in filling up the gap with ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλ.

The next variant, which is one of great importance, has been omitted by Sanders in his list (p. 11), viz.

D has πολυν συνεβαλλετο εν ταις εκκλησιαις
ευτονως γαρ τοις ιουδαιοις διακατηλεγχετο

omitting the words τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος (*om.* διὰ τῆς χάριτος 614, Λ^{g}, *vg.*, 𝔖^{ph}, *Aug*), which occur in Γ, *cett.* after συνεβ. πολύ.

The omission of *D* is shared by 𝔓.

I do not on this account wish to reject the words omitted by *D*, 𝔓, since they have a genuine ring, and a dative seems to be required after συν̣εβάλλετο. As *D* frequently omits στίχοι, I prefer to think that a στίχος containing these words has dropped out of a common ancestor of *D*, 𝔓, arranged in στίχοι similar to those found in *D*, i. e. after ἐκκλησίαις.

28 διαλεγόμενος καί *D*, δ: δια̣[λεγομεν]ος, without καί 𝔓: *om.* Γ, *cett.*, *Aug*. (The omission of καί by 𝔓 is an insignificant error.)

xix 3 ἔλεγον *D*, 𝔓: εἶπον (-αν) Γ*E*δ: responderunt Λ^{g}, *Hier.*

5 εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν *D*, δ, 𝔖^{ph}: [εις α]φ̣ε̣σ̣ι̣ν̣ α̣μ̣α̣ρ̣τιων 𝔓: *om. cett.*, *Petil. Hier. Ambr*. There can be no doubt that Sanders' supplement is correct.

6 εὐθέως ἐπέπεσεν *D*, *Hier.*: επε[πεσεν] 𝔓: ἦλθεν Γ, *cett.*, *Petil. Cass.*

(*b*) Agreement of 𝔓 with δ, against *cett.* (*D*).

xix 13 ὁρκίζω] ἐξορκίζομεν δ, 𝔓 (*pluralem tuentur vg*^{a}, 𝔖).

(*c*) Original contributions of 𝔓.

xviii 28 τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶνα̣ι Χριστόν *D*, 𝔖, *Aug.*: εἶναι τὸν (*om.* τόν *E*) Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Γ*E*δ: χρ̄ν̣ [ειναι] ιη̄ν 𝔓.

Any one of these collocations is equally possible.

2 καὶ εὑρών τινας μαθήτας εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς *D*: καὶ εὑρεῖν τινας μαθήτας εἶπέν τε (ὁ δὲ εἶπεν) πρὸς αὐτούς Γ. Sanders ascribes to 𝔓 κ̣α̣ι̣ [ειπεν τοι]ς μαθηταις. If so, it is clear that 𝔓 had a shorter reading than that found in other MSS. It is, however, very abrupt to say that St Paul spoke to the disciples in Ephesus, without first mentioning that he found disciples there. Either 𝔓 has left something out or has abbreviated the text.

After πιστεύσαντες 𝔓 has an addition which Sanders reads as το ιδιο̣̄ [το̄]υ κῡ εινα[ι]. He explains τὸ ἴδιον as meaning 'characteristic property or quality' and translates 'having believed that it is the characteristic quality of the Lord'. If this is really the reading of 𝔓, it is a surprising variant. A better sense would be produced if 𝔓 had τὸν υἱόν τοῦ θῡ εἶναι, but even this addition would be suspicious, since πιστεύσαντες (= 'when ye believed') gives an excellent sense by itself.

3 ο δε παυλος προς αυ[του]ς 𝔓. The nearest approach to this is

εἶπέν τε (*δέ*) *πρὸς αὐτούς* 383, 𝔖^{vg}, *Sah.*, *Hier.* The other readings are: *εἶπεν δὲ* (*τε*) *D B* Λ^{g}, *Petil.*: *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν* ℵ*AE*: *εἶπεν οὖν* 614, 𝔖^{ph}. None of them give ὁ Παῦλος, which has the appearance of a gloss.

12 *ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς αὐτοῦ cett.* (*D*): 𝔓 omits *αὐτοῦ*.

13 *ὃν* Παῦλος *κηρύσσει cett.* (*D*): *ον* [*κηρυ*]*σσει ο παυλος* 𝔓.

To these may be added an instance mentioned in a previous section of this paper, viz. xix 14, where, in a passage omitted by Γ, 𝔓 inserts *ο* [*αποστο*]*λος* after Παῦλος against *D* and *c. Thom.*

Sanders is not enthusiastic about the additions in 𝔓 and thinks them 'rather additions by an intelligent reader than survivals of the original text'. He, however, considers them to be 'excellent illustrations' of the way in which what he calls the 'Western paraphrase' arose. I agree with his first remark, but disagree with the second, since I hold an entirely different view of the *Z* text and its relation to that of Γ.

I have not included in these lists certain cases in which the supplements adopted by Sanders seem to be insecure, viz.

xix. 5 Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D*: *τοῦ* Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Γ. Sanders ascribes to 𝔓 *του κ̄*[*υ ιη̄ῡ του χριστου*]. It is a grave objection that Χριστοῦ has to be written in full in order to fill up the vacant space, instead of the usual abbreviation (*χρ̄υ*). I suspect that 𝔓 in addition to *χρ̄υ* inserted *ἡμῶν* after *κῡ*[1]. It may be added that Χριστοῦ is here supported by δ, Λ^{g}, 𝔖, *Sah.*, as well as by *D*. No MS adds *ἡμῶν* here, but the word frequently occurs after *κύριος*, in some, or all, MSS.

6 *καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς χεῖρα τοῦ* Παύλου *D*, Λ^{g}, *vg*^{a}, 𝔖*vg*, *Petil.*: *καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ* Π. *χεῖρας* Γ, *cett.* Sanders ascribes to 𝔓 *κ̣*[*αι επιθεντος αυτοις το*]*υ πα*[*υλου χειρα*], remarking that enough is preserved to shew that the order of the words is not that of *D*, but that 'the space is exactly right for the singular *χεῖρα*' and that 'the addition of another letter would crowd the space'. I should hesitate to claim an agreement with *D* on this evidence.

13 *τινες ἐκ τῶν D*, Λ^{g}: *τινες καὶ τῶν* Γ, *cett.* Sanders gives *τινες κ̣*[*αι εκ των περιερχομενω*]*ν* as the reading of 𝔓 and says (p. 7) that 'this is clearly the original out of which both the "Western" and the common text arose by the omission of a single word'. If the supplement is correct, which I doubt, I should be disposed to say that in 𝔓 the two strains were conflated.

16 Sanders gives as the reading of 𝔓:

[*υ*]*μ̣*[*εις δε τινε*]*ς εσ̣*[*τε και εφαλομενος*
[*ο ανθρωπος ε*]*π α̣*[*υτους. . . .*

He here adopts *ἐφαλομενος* (Γ) in preference to *ἐναλλόμενος* (*D*) and

---

[1] Prof. Hunt has made the same suggestion, and I gather from him that it is accepted by Sanders.

ἐφαλλόμενος (*E* δ). The difference between these variants consists of a single letter, which is not much to go upon when the text is so defective. In l. 2 *D* has *εἰς αὐτούς*, Γ δ *ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς*, and *E ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς*. If the *π* is certain in 𝔓, it supports Γ against *D*, but it remains uncertain, whether it had *αὐτούς* or *αὐτοῖς*.

There remain a few trivial variants connected with the use of the article, which are best taken together. I need hardly say that I attach no importance to them, as the MSS are capricious in such matters, and *D* is notoriously lax. The instances which I have noticed are xix 4 ὁ *D*: *om.* Γ *E* δ, 𝔓: 5 *τοῦ* (before Κυρίου) *cett.* 𝔓: *om. D* (so also in *v.* 13): 12 *τά* (before *πονηρά*) cett. 𝔓 (so also in *v.* 13): *ib.* ὁ (before Παῦλος) 𝔓: *om. cett.*, 14 *τόν* (after *πρός*) *D*: *om.* 𝔓. To these may be added two doubtful cases, viz. xix. 7, where Sanders in his supplement, on grounds of space, ascribes to 𝔓 the omission of *τό* before *πνεῦμα*, and 15, also in a supplement, where for the same reason he gives *ι̅η̅ν* for *τον ι̅η̅ν* as the reading of 𝔓.

I conclude with a few remarks upon the lost portion of 𝔓 between xix. 6 *ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς* and 12 *ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας*. Sanders points out that this would form part of the first page, and occupy sixteen lines of the papyrus. I do not doubt the accuracy of his conclusion, but his method of comparing the portions lost and preserved with lines in Ropes' edition is not very exact. In such a case I prefer to count the letters.

The figures which are yielded by his transcript of p. i (I exclude l. 21 as imperfect) are:

40, 38, 33, 33, 32, 32, 33, 34, 34, 38, 33, 34, 33, 31, 33, 34, 33, 32, 33, 34 = 677.

This gives an average of 34 letters to a line (34 × 20 = 680). In l. 1 I have taken the six dots at the beginning to represent letters, but the line is curiously long. Line 21, which is imperfect, requires 14 more letters to bring it up to the average. If Sanders is correct in supposing that 16 lines have perished, their contents should be 34 × 16 = 544 letters.

In Γ, allowing for abbreviations of *nomina sacra* (θ̅ς̅, κ̅ς̅), the total number of letters between *αὐτούς* in *v.* 6 and *ἐπί* in *v.* 12 is 448. From this must be deducted 14 letters required to complete l. 21 after *αὐτούς*, so the total is reduced to 434. The differences between this and 544 is considerable.

D does not differ greatly from Γ, the only extra matter being:—

v. 8 + ὁ Παῦλος, with Λ^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: + *ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ*, with *c. Thom.*

9 + *αὐτῶν*, with Λ^{g}, 𝔖^{vg}: + *τῶν ἐθνῶν τότε* (*om. τότε E*), with *E*, 𝔖: + ὁ Παῦλος, with 𝔖^{vg}: + *τινος*, with most authorities (*om.* Γ, *Sah.*): + *ἀπὸ ὥρας ε′ ἕως δεκάτης*, with δ, Λ^{g}, *vg*^{aw}, 𝔖^{ph}, *Ambst.*

Allowing for *nomina sacra* the number of letters is 514, from which we have to deduct 14 on account of l. 21, i.e. we get a total of 500.[1] This still falls short of 544.

I now come to *c. Thom.*, which in *v.* 6 has a famous variant. Γ *cett.*, including *D* and 𝔖$^{\text{ph}}$, give *ἐλάλουν δὲ γλώσσαις καὶ ἐπροφήτευον*. The reading of *c. Thom.* is given in White's edition as:

Et loquebantur linguis aliis et sentiebant in se ipsis quod et interpretarentur illas illi ipsi; quidam autem prophetabant. The extra matter after *γλώσσαις* represents:—
ἑτέραις καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὥστε καὶ ἑρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς ἑαυτοῖς· τινὲς δέ (= 66 letters).

Λ$^{\text{p}}$ has above the line and out of place, viz. after *ἐπροφήτευον* *ita ut ipsi sibi interpretarentur*. This represents *ὥστε καὶ ἑρμ. αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς* (= 30 letters), omitting the other additions given by *c. Thom.* The same variant is found in several Vulgate MSS, which have incorporated readings from *Z.* Ephrem's words in *Cat.*$^{\text{arm}}$. 'they spoke with tongues and interpreted of themselves' may be quoted in connexion with this shorter reading. It is easy to see how, if an ancestor written in *στίχοι* had:

και επεγινωσκον εν εαυτοις
ωστε και ερμηνευειν αυτας εαυτοις

one of the *στίχοι* might drop out.

If we credit 𝔓 with the whole of the extra matter given by *c. Thom.* in *v.* 6 we get a total of 500 + 66 = 566, which is near enough to 544 to make it probable that 𝔓 had here something like the reading of *c. Thom.* If so, this is an important agreement between 𝔓 and *c. Thom.* against *D*, which has been brought into conformity with Γ.

There is a curious circumstance which I mention with all reserve, viz. that if 𝔓 omitted the words *καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* (23 letters) for which there is no Latin evidence (*cf. Ephrem*), otherwise reading with *c. Thom.*, the total becomes 500 + 43 = 543, which may be described as absolute agreement with the desired number 544. This, of course, is merely a suggestion, as so much is uncertain.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

---

[1] In this calculation I treat γ̄ in *v.* 8 (*τρεῖς* Γ) and ε̄ (= *πέμπτης*) in *v.* 9 as single letters.

AN UNCIAL (PALIMPSEST) MANUSCRIPT OF MUTIANUS IN THE COLLECTION OF A. CHESTER BEATTY.

THE purpose of this note is to call the attention of scholars to a palimpsest of Mutianus and to a new and remarkable collection of manuscripts.

A Latin translation of John Chrysostom's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews apparently did not exist before the time of Cassiodorus,[1] who found it necessary to have one made for the use of his monks at Vivarium. The translator was Mutianus, as we learn from chap. viii of the *Institutiones* which Cassiodorus wrote about 544.[2] That Mutianus's version was well known in the Middle Ages and read in many centres is to be gathered from the mention of it in numerous early catalogues from the ninth century onwards.[3] Thus it is found at St Gall, Lorsch, Bobbio, Pomposa, St Riquier, St Vaast, Durham, Cluny, Tournay, Limoges, to mention only the best-known libraries. No contemporary copy of Mutianus has come down. Heretofore the oldest extant witnesses known to scholars were MSS of the ninth century.[4] Recently, however, a copy has come to light which is a little more than a century removed from the original. This copy is, unfortunately, a palimpsest, and so well has the primary text been obliterated that no traces of it were discerned by expert observers like Schenkl and Lindsay.[5] I myself had the MS in my hands in 1920 and never suspected it of being palimpsest.[6] It is to Mr Eric G. Millar of the British Museum that the credit of discovery belongs.[1] It was made, as I learn, quite accidentally. He happened to turn a leaf so that it came directly in front of his electric lamp, the light from which was so powerful that it brought out the palimpsest-character in astonishingly clear fashion. A few leaves were treated with reagents and were found to contain a commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews which was soon identified as that of Mutianus Scholasticus. This instructive and happy experience should lead to interesting finds on the part of other librarians.

---

[1] See E. Riggenbach *Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare zum Hebräerbrief*, Zahn's *Forsch. zur Gesch. d. neutestamentlichen Kanons* viii 1 (1907), 2, to which Prof. Souter kindly called my attention.

[2] 'Ad Hebraeos vero epistolam quam sanctus Iohannes Constantinopolitanus episcopus triginta quattuor homiliis Attico sermone tractavit, Mutianum virum disertissimum transferre fecimus in Latinum ne Epistolarum ordo continuus indecoro termino subito rumperetur' (Migne *Patr. Lat.* 7c, col. 1120).

[3] The index to G. Becker's *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885) p. 315 merely informs one that the version is found in many libraries. For more precise reference see Riggenbach *loc. cit.*

[4] On Prof. Souter's authority Riggenbach mentions the following MSS: Verona 54 (52), Milan Ambros. A. 135 inf., Cologne 61, and Cues 19.

[5] Cf. H. Schenkl *Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica* i 2 (Vienna, 1892), 114 f, and W. M. Lindsay *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915) p. 452.

[6] It was also unknown to Traube or we should find it in his list of uncial manuscripts in *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen* i (Munich, 1909) 181, to which should also be added Cheltenham 22229, a leaf from an eighth-century MS of the gospels written in France.

The text of Mutianus was written in a clear, bold type of Italian uncial characters of about the end of the seventh century. The MS formed a stately volume in which each page measured 365 × 266 mm. ($14\frac{3}{8} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in.), and was divided into two columns of thirty-one lines, with an interval of 18.5 mm. ($\frac{3}{4}$ in.) between the columns, the written space measuring 307 × 209 mm. ($12\frac{1}{8} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ in.).

It is possible that the library in which this uncial MS happened to be a century or so after it was written had a minuscule copy of Mutianus, rendering the older one obsolete, or it may be that there was a great scarcity of parchment and hardly any interest in Mutianus—whatever the cause may have been, about the end of the eighth century the uncial text of Mutianus was erased to make room for a minuscule copy of various works of St Augustine and the *Carmen Apologeticum* of Commodianus.

The MS in which the text of Mutianus lies buried is well known to patristic scholars under the press-mark of Cheltenham 12261.[2] In 1924 it passed from the Phillipps Collection in Cheltenham to the Beatty Collection in London, where it bears the number 3. It consists of 197 leaves of which ff. 1–111 are palimpsest. These 111 leaves formed $55\frac{1}{2}$ leaves of the original uncial MS. Whether or not scholars will ever be able to collate the oldest extant witness to Mutianus, still for the most part invisible, must depend on the owner's willingness to submit the palimpsest to treatment by reagents, which would, of course, involve disfiguring the best part of the MS.[3] Fortunately, scientists are at work on the problem of finding a process of photography which will effectively reproduce the underscript without the aid of chemical reagents. Such a discovery would be a boon indeed to palaeography as well as to letters.[4]

The MS which contains the submerged text of Mutianus is of great value quite apart from the uncial underscript, for the eighth-century minuscule script gives us the best text of St Augustine's *De Utilitate Credendi* and the unique text of Commodianus' *Carmen Apologeticum*.[1] It is a curious fact that the text of Commodianus's *Instructiones* is preserved in a MS which is also unique and which also formerly belonged to the Phillipps Collection (no. 1825) and is now at Berlin (no. 167).[2] It is quite probable that the two MSS actually hail from the same general region.[3] The poems of Commodianus were evidently little read in the Middle Ages. One finds no mention of them in mediaeval catalogues,[4] and, as has been said, only two ancient copies have actually reached us. Now Berlin 167 originated, as script and abbreviations go to shew, in some North Italian centre, which was probably Verona.[5] While there is nothing to connect our palimpsest with Verona, there can be no doubt that it formed part of the old library of S. Silvestro of Nonantola, near Modena, where it may have been written.[6] The oldest MSS of Nonantola present an interesting literary and palaeographical problem which still awaits solution.[7] A number of them are written in a type of minuscule so like early Beneventan as to be practically indistinguishable from it. This may, of course, be explained as a simple migration of MSS from the south to the north. There is some historical support for this theory: for Anselm, the first abbot of Nonantola, when exiled by King Desiderius (†774), is said to have gone to Monte Cassino whence he brought back many books.[8] But the Chronicle of Monte Cassino does not record his visit, and the MSS of Nonantola are, on the whole, so much superior to South Italian products of the same time (Paris Lat. 7530, Cava 2, Casanatensis 641)[9] as to make it seem unlikely that they come from the same school. Moreover, the uncial MSS of Nonantola nearly all shew features which are distinctly North Italian.[1] What is true of them is probably true of the early minuscule MSS. They were written either at Nonantola or at some other North Italian centre. The resemblance which their script bears to early Beneventan seems perfectly natural if it be remembered that 'the Beneventan is, in reality, nothing more than a continuation in South Italy of the traditional Italian school' and that 'a Beneventan script becomes apparent only by contrast with those scripts which succumbed to the Caroline reform'.[2] Any one desiring to study the Codices Nonantolani will in the future have to resort to the Beatty Collection, which contains no less than eight MSS which give evidence of having belonged to Nonantola.

---

[1] The palimpsest is described in the catalogue cited in full below, p. 32, n. 3.

[2] Described by Schenkl *loc. cit.*

[3] The facsimile in the Beatty catalogue shews that the text could be easily deciphered if reagents were applied.

[4] The most successful efforts so far have been made by the monks of Beuron.

---

[1] See J. Zycha's preface to his edition in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* xxv (1891) sect. vi pt. i, and Dombart's preface to vol. xv in the same series. A new edition is expected from Dr J. Martin of Würzburg. Cf. his *Commodianea* in the Vienna *Sitzungsberichte* clxxxi 6 (1917).

[2] See V. Rose *Die Lateinischen Meermann-Handschriften des Sir Thomas Phillipps in Königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin* (Berlin, 1892) p. 374.

[3] Prof. Lindsay (*Notae Latinae* p. 452) was ready to regard the two poems as parts of one manuscript, but this is impossible as the two differ not only in script but also in size.

[4] At least they are not found in the catalogues published by G. Becker cited above, p. 29, n. 3.

[5] Cf. Lindsay *op. cit.* p. 447. The form of *g* is remarkably like that found in many Veronese MSS.

[6] See Millar's description of the MS in the new catalogue.

[7] On the dispersal of the Nonantola library see I. Giorgi in *Archivio delle Biblioteche e degli archivi* vi (1896) 54 ff.

[8] See Muratori *Antiquitates Italicae* iv 944, and Waitz *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, *SS. Rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum* pp. 503 and 517.

[9] See the facsimiles in Traube's *Quellen und Untersuchungen* iii 3 (Munich, 1908).

This brings me to the second part of my note—the Beatty Collection. A catalogue of a portion of the collection has just appeared.[3] It consists of a pair of magnificent volumes, one of text and one of plates, which describe and illustrate forty-three Latin MSS, ranging from the eighth to the thirteenth century. Five more similar pairs of volumes are promised: two to deal with later Latin MSS, two with Oriental, and one with Greek, Coptic, &c. The task of describing the Western MSS has been entrusted to the able hands of E. G. Millar. Such is the careful and scholarly work bestowed on the first forty-three MSS that the catalogue at once takes rank amongst the finest in existence. It is also one of the most beautiful; and for this credit is due to Emery Walker, Ltd., and to the Oxford University Press. In fact, lovers of ancient MSS have rarely been put under so great an obligation by a catalogue, and they are indebted to Mr Beatty for a generosity bordering on munificence in the illustrations. The forty-three MSS described are accorded no less than ninety-nine monochrome and three coloured folio-size plates, which are as splendid specimens of the art of mechanical reproduction as can anywhere be found.

Nearly all of Mr Beatty's MSS have been purchased in the last half-dozen years. All the oldest and several of the finest come from the Phillipps Collection—twenty-five in all. Not since 1889, when Berlin acquired the handsome lot of Meerman Phillippici (nos. 1338–2010), have such inroads been made upon the oldest section of the Cheltenham Collection. The twenty-five Phillippici acquired by Mr Beatty are sufficiently important to warrant giving a list of them with their past and present press-marks.

---

[1] I refer especially to the form of N. The Codices Sessoriani in uncial script are enumerated in Traube's *Vorles. u. Abh.* i 228–229.

[2] E. A. Lowe *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford, 1914) p. 95.

[3] *The Library of A. Chester Beatty; a descriptive catalogue of the western manuscripts*, by Eric George Millar, vol. i, manuscripts 1–43 (Oxford, 1927).

Beatty	Phillipps	Contents	Date and Provenance
1	36275	Bede *Hist. Eccl.*	s. viii (Anglo-Saxon)
2	8400	Homiliary	s. viii ex. (Ottobeuren)
3	12261	Augustine, Commodianus	s. viii ex. (Nonantola)
4	12260	Epistola Datiani, Fulgentius, &c.	s. viii–ix (Nonantola)
5	12264	Augustine *Sermons*	s. viii–ix (Nonantola)
6	12263	Eugippius *Exc. from Aug.*	s. viii–ix (Nonantola)
7	12262	Bede *Comment. Can. Epist.*	s. viii–ix (Nonantola)
9	2165 & 21787	Gospels	s. ix (Franco-Saxon)
10	14122	Gospels (fragm.)	s. ix ex. (Franco-Saxon)
11	10190	Ansegisi *Capitula*	s. ix ex. (Tours)
12	6546	Canons of Councils	s. ix–x (Nonantola)
13	389	Canons of Councils	s. x (Germany)
14	390	Canons of Councils	s. x (Germany)
15	3075	Eutropius	s. x (Nonantola)
16	3674	Gregory *Dialogues*	s. x (France)
17	12348	Gospels	c. 1000 (Flanders)
18	934 & 2708	Gregory *Homilies*	s. xi–xii (France)
22	4769	Bible	s. xii (Walsingham Priory)
23	3535 or 3534	Lectionary	s. xii (Flanders, S. Trond)
24	21948	Minor Prophets, glossed	s. xii (Flanders, Anchin ?)
29	3344	Job, glossed	s. xii (Flanders)
31	1092	Bede on *Luke*	s. xii (Germany, Gladbach)
32	4597	Psalter with Peter Lombard	s. xii (Germany)
33	385	Suetonius	s. xii ex. (France ?)
43	12269	Augustine *City of God*	s. xi–xii (Nonantola)

Apart from the MSS of the Phillipps Collection Mr Beatty has drawn widely from other sources. His collection contains examples of some of the finest mediaeval schools of France, Germany, Flanders, and England, the last country being represented by magnificent MSS from Bury St Edmunds and St Augustine's, Canterbury. Very beautiful are the two MSS from the school of Tours (the ninth-century Gospels formerly in the possession of Henry Yates Thompson and the Capitula Ansegisi) and from the Franco-Saxon school. Striking, too, is the tenth-century Evangeliarium (MS 42) from Germany. Of the later period, mention should be made of the remarkable initials in the MS of St Augustine's *City of God* (MS 43), and the exquisitely beautiful leaves from a Psalter illuminated by W. De Brailes, in England, about 1240.[1] In fact, there is hardly a MS in the collection that does not gladden the heart of a student of MSS.

E. A. LOWE.

---

[1] The description of these leaves as well as of the Tours gospels from H. Yates Thompson's collection is by the great connoisseur of mediaeval art, Sidney G. Cockerell.

NOTE ON EPIPHANIUS *PANARION* xxxi 5–6.

Of the copious literature which arose under the inspiration of Valentinian teaching and missionary propaganda, few documents have come down to us, and for this reason the little apocalypse found in Epiphanius xxxi 5–6 deserves special consideration. Its literary form and opening address, *παρὰ φρονίμοις, παρὰ δὲ ψυχικοῖς, παρὰ δὲ σαρκικοῖς, παρὰ δὲ κοσμικοῖς, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Μεγέθει Νοῦς ἀκατάργητος τοῖς ἀκαταργήτοις χαίρειν*, suggest the Hermetic literature,[1] and it is undoubtedly a product of roughly the same age and of a similar environment. Like the Hermetic literature, its author and exact date are unknown, but Dibellius has assigned it, with some probability, to a period sometime after that of the great Valentinian teachers, Heracleon and Ptolemy.[2]

The apocalypse was written by a Valentinian prophet and theologian to fellow-Valentinians, and in this fact lies both its value and the source of much difficulty in interpreting it. The author and his readers shared many assumptions, and the casual allusions which sufficed to call them to their minds are not always transparent to modern readers, but enough of the system can be made out to reveal it as an interesting and original developement of Valentinian thought. Although both the mythological and the philosophical material are familiar from other Valentinian sources, the combination is novel, and the result is a type of theology as distinctive and probably as significant for Valentinianism as many varieties of more orthodox speculation were in the early developement of Catholic doctrine.

The substance of this, as of all Valentinian systems, was the explanation of the phenomenal world as an episode in a vast cosmic drama of supernatural forces. The interest in the drama far outweighed the interest in what it explained, and the creation of the world, though accounted for, plays no large part in the story. Of somewhat more concern is the problem of salvation and escape from this world, but even this is an episode in the history of celestial powers whose own difficulties, defeats, and triumphs occupy the centre of the stage.

Compared with some Valentinian systems, the plot is a simple one. In the beginning all reality was one in the Father. He, who is called *ὁ Αὐτοπάτωρ, ὁ Ἄτρεπτος, τὸ Μέγεθος, ὁ προὼν Ἀγέννητος, ὁ Αἰὼν ἀγήρατος, ὁ Βυθός*, existed in a state of tranquil unconsciousness, until the female principle, implicit in him, stirred him with a desire to create. As in other Valentinian sources, this female principle is called Σιγή, Χάρις, Ἔννοια, but the explanation of two of her names Σιγή and Χάρις is original, . . . ἐκείνη, ἣν τινες Ἔννοιαν ἔφασαν, ἕτεροι Χάριν· οἰκείως, διὰ τὸ ἐπικεχορηγηκέναι αὐτὴν θησαυρίσματα τοῦ Μεγέθους τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ Μεγέθους, οἱ δὲ ἀληθεύσαντες Σιγὴν προσηγόρευσαν, ὅτι δι' ἐνθυμήσεως χώρις λόγου τὰ ἅπαντα τὸ Μέγεθος ἐτελείωσεν.' The explanation of Χάρις is a reference to her work of redemption, described later on (*Pan.* xxxi 6. 6–7 H, p. 394. 7 ff). The interpretation of Σιγή recalls, as Holl has observed, a passage in *Excerpta ex Theodoto* § 7 ἄγνωστος οὖν ὁ Πατὴρ ὤν, ἠθέλησεν γνωσθῆναι τοῖς αἰῶσι, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐνθυμήσεως τῆς ἑαυτοῦ, ὡς ἂν ἑαυτὸν ἐγνωκώς, πνεῦμα γνώσεως οὔσης ἐν γνώσει προέβαλε τὸν Μονογενῆ. γέγονεν οὖν καὶ ὁ ἀπὸ γνώσεως, τουτέστι τῆς πατρικῆς ἐνθυμήσεως, προελθὼν Γνῶσις, τουτέστιν ὁ υἱός, ὅτι "δι' υἱοῦ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐγνώσθη". In both *Excerpta* 7 and the apocalypse the element of desire and volition is strongly emphasized; but the author of the apocalypse goes much farther in this direction, and declares that creation was the product of a vague thought and not its well-reasoned expression, δι' ἐνθυμήσεως χώρις λόγου τὰ ἅπαντα τὸ Μέγεθος ἐτελείωσεν.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Poimandres 1, Hippolytus *Ref.* vi 42. 2 (Wendland p. 173. 20), Iren. i 8 (Harvey, i pp. 128 ff), R. Reitzenstein *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* Leipzig 1910, pp. 133–134.

[2] O. Dibellius *Studien zur Geschichte der Valentinianer* II, *Zeitschrift für neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft* ix (1908) p. 329 ff.

It is important to notice here a radical simplification of the usual Valentinian myth in which the original impulse for creation comes from the first principle himself, Sige acting merely as the instrument of his thought.[2] The projection of the aeons in the pleroma is all a consequence of this impulse, and difficulties arise only when one of the inferior aeons, Sophia—the last to emerge—wishes to rise above her station. In the apocalypse the whole scheme of emanations is the result of Sige's restless will. It is she who rouses the desire of Megethos, and it is she who personally superintends the whole process of creation and redemption. Her motive, at first, is like Sophia's, the wish for complete unity with Autopator, but, unlike her counterpart, she is successful, and instead of an abortion, the reflexion of Sophia's luckless passion, she bears the Father of Truth, through whom the line of emanations is transmitted.

Sige's desire is described in picturesque but mysterious language: βουληθεῖσα δεσμὰ ῥῆξαι ἐθήλυνε τὸ Μέγεθος ἐπ' ὀρέξει ἀναπαύσεως αὐτοῦ.

---

[1] This is in contradiction both to the theory of *Excerpta* 7 f. (cf. *Ext. ex Theod.* 8. 2 "πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο", κατὰ τὴν προσεχῆ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ ἐν ταὐτότητι λόγου, τά τε πνευματικὰ καὶ νοητὰ καὶ αἰσθητά) and to the Marcosian Apocalypse, Iren. i 8. 1 (H. i pp. 128–129) 'Quando primum Pater, cuius pater nemo est, qui est inexcogitabilis et insubstantivus, qui neque masculus neque femina est, voluit suum inerrabile narrabile fieri, et quod invisibile sibi est formari; aperuit os, et protulit Verbum simile sibi: quod adsistens ostendit ei quod erat ipse, cum invisibilis forma apparuisset'.

[2] Cf. Iren. i 1. 1 (H. i p. 9), Hippolytus *Ref.* vi 29. 5 (W. p. 156).

These δεσμά were evidently the bonds which held the aeons in their appointed rank and preserved the order of the divine hierarchy.[1] 'Ανάπαυσις is here a technical term for the status occupied by a particular aeon, and the verb ἀναπαύεσθαι means, elsewhere in the apocalypse, to occupy such a rank.[2]

After the appearance of the Father of Truth the work of emanation goes on in the usual manner, though the order and names of the aeons differ, in some respects, from those of other Valentinian systems. The first four, or ἡ προοῦσα τετράς, are Bythos, Sige, Pater, and Aletheia. The next four, the τετρὰς πνευματική, are Anthropos, Ecclesia, Logos, and Zoe. Then, at the wish of Bythos, Anthropos and Ecclesia unite to produce twelve aeons, six male and six female, and Logos and Zoe similarly produce ten other aeons, bringing the total number up to thirty. The whole group is called the Τριακάς; but in this scheme one aeon has been entirely neglected. In the production of Aletheia the partner of the Father of Truth or Anthropos was Φῶς. This Φῶς does not appear again, nor is she reckoned in the Triakas, and she must not be confused with the male aeon Θελητὸς-Φῶς,[3] any more than Anthropos, the partner of Ecclesia, must be confused with his parent the Father of Truth who is also called Anthropos.[4] It is true that Φῶς plays only the most fleeting role, for she is immediately supplanted by Aletheia, who, in conjunction with her own father, produces the spiritual Tetrad; but it is a curious vagary that her existence is considered so ephemeral that she is not even given a place in the Triakas.

With the completion of the Triakas one stage in the history of the emanations is reached, and it is at this point, ordinarily, that trouble begins with Sophia's unruly affections.[5] In the apocalypse it is the uneasiness of Bythos that disturbs the harmony of the Triakas. The company has grown too numerous for him and he longs, if not for the seclusion of his original unconscious state, at least for a more limited and select group of companions. He therefore withdraws from the Triakas the first eight aeons (*ἡ προοῦσα αὐθεντικὴ Ὀγδοάς*) and substitutes for them eight others. The reason given for this change is, *οὐ γὰρ ἦν Μεγέθους φρόνημα εἰς ἀριθμὸν πίπτειν.* Scornful allusion has already been made to those who attempt to understand the element of number in the Triakas by counting the aeons in it. The point is evidently that, whereas the Triakas, in its original condition, was a substantial unity in which individual differences were secondary and incidental, differentiation had been carried so far that a genuine plurality might be suspected. To reduce this danger, Bythos removed the original Ogdoad from the Triakas. This action had a marked effect on the nature and status of all the other aeons. Separated from immediate and substantial unity with Bythos and the rest of the Ogdoad, the Triakas lost caste and became a thing apart. It is now called *τριακὰς ἀπηρτισμένη*, and its members stand in need of salvation to be united once more with the Godhead which has abandoned them.

---

[1] In the 'Docetic' system of Hippolytus *Ref.* viii 8. 8 (W. p. 227. 14 ff) the third aeon, apparently through fear of being crowded out of touch with the supreme God by the alarming growth of his two brothers, τρὶς νοήσας ἑαυτόν, οἱονεὶ δεσμόν τινα τῆς ἑνότητος αὐτὸν ἔδησεν αἰώνιον. The purpose of the δεσμά in the two systems is different, for the one invented by the third aeon was to secure his place against the encroachments of other aeons, while that which Sige desired to break was one which kept her in her proper place against her will. Nevertheless in both systems there is the idea of a bond which preserves the established order in the supernatural world.

[2] Cf. xxxi 6. 4 (H. p. 393. 10–11, p. 394. 2), xxxi 6. 5 (H. p. 394. 6) and *Exc. ex Theodoto* 63. 1, Iren. i 1. 4 (H. i p. 22. 4), Hippolytus *Ref.* vi 29. 5 (W. p. 156).

[3] Cf. xxxi 5. 6 (H. p. 391. 8), xxxi 5. 8 (H. p. 392. 10).

[4] Cf. xxxi 5. 8 (H. p. 392. 6), xxxi 5. 5–6 (H. p. 391. 7–9).

[5] Cf. Iren. i 1. 2 (H. i p. 14), *idem* i 1. 3 (H. i p. 16), Hippolytus *Ref.* vi 30. 6 (W. pp. 157–158).

The theory of salvation presented by the apocalypse is singularly difficult, and occasional mutilations of the text have not helped the understanding of it; but two stages in the process can be distinguished. The first includes the production of the *φῶτα*, and, in this, Bythos is the principal actor; the second sees the salvation of the *φῶτα* and the redemption of the Triakas, and in this Sige plays the leading role. No sooner had the original Ogdoad come to rest after its separation from the Triakas, than it became subject to fresh disturbances. A split within the original male principle takes place, a kind of dissociation of personality, and, at Megethos's instigation, Bythos breaks away from him to be united with the Triakas. The result of this is a period of renewed productivity and the appearance of the 'incorruptible Lights', *φῶτα ἄφθαρτα*, who are called *Ἑνότητος τέκνα.*[1] A curious feature of these Lights is that there are two sets of them. When the secondary Ogdoad is substituted for the original eight, it is said to have been 'united with the Lights and become a separated Triakas'. Here the Lights are plainly the twenty-two aeons who were abandoned by the original Ogdoad. The *φῶτα ἄφθαρτα* are, however, offspring of those aeons who were first called Lights and it is they who are described in xxxi 6. 5 as *φῶτα ἄφθαρτα, ἅτινα Ἑνότητος ὠνομάσθησαν τέκνα καὶ* ἀχαρακτήριστα ἦσαν and in xxxi 5. 6 as οἱ ἐξ αὐτῶν (i.e. the original Lights) εἰς αἰσθητικὰ μερισθέντες.[1]

---

[1] Holl has followed Dibellius in emending *ἑνότητος* of the manuscripts to *μεσότητος*, xxxi 6. 5 (H. p. 394. 4), cf. Dibellius *op. cit.* p. 395. This is hardly justified. In xxxi 6. 9 (H. p. 395. 8) the *τῆς μεσότητος υἱοί* appear and are products not of the Triakas but of the second Ogdoad and the holy Spirit. In *Exc. ex Theod.* *ἑνότης* is used as a name for the pleroma, cf. *Exc. ex Theod.* 32. 1, 36. 1, but in Iren. i v. 2 (H. i pp. 103 ff) *Ἑνότης* is one member of the original dyad.

The second stage of the process of salvation begins with Sige's desire that all the ἄφθαρτα φῶτα should be saved εἰς ἐκλογὴν γνώσεως. For this purpose she is united, in an incorruptible mingling and by a rational desire, with the second Ogdoad which had been substituted for the first. This rational desire (νοϊκὴ βούλησις) was a holy Spirit who descended upon the second Ogdoad, as Bythos had descended upon the Triakas. More emanations ensue and five new aeons are added to the list. The redemption of the Triakas, which is effected by Bythos and by Sige through the holy Spirit, consists in its restoration to substantial unity with the original Ogdoad, first by the union of Bythos with the Triakas and then by the union of Sige with the second Ogdoad. In this way all the aeons are brought within the original ity of the Godhead. The connexion of these high mysteries with the problem of salvation on earth is obscure, but help may be derived from two sources. When the holy Spirit is introduced, he is qualified as τὸ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν. Evidently his work did not end with the production of the last five aeons, but extended to the perfection of the Valentinian communities in which those who were destined for the election of knowledge congregated.

Another clue is to be found in the theory of Lights. The αἰσθητικὰ φῶτα must be the τέλειοι, or rather that spiritual part of them which survived death. This view is confirmed by a comparison with a similar theory in the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*. Here we have angels who are counterparts of the aeons or Lights, and τὰ διαφέροντα σπέρματα who contain some portion of the angelic substance from which they were derived and some loose connexion with the angelic beings from whom they were separated.[2] These σπέρματα are restored to unity with their angelic guardians and ultimately admitted to the unity of the pleroma —the orthodox Valentinian equivalent of the τριακάς—at the request of the Mother and with the help of a Saviour, Jesus. The ideas of unity and separation, of salvation through an agent and at the instigation of a female aeon, of a separated area which needs to be restored, of celestial and earthly beings so closely united as to form complementary aspects of a common whole—all these the two systems have in common. Even the cryptic statement in Epiphan. xxxi 6. 6, that each of the φῶτα αἰσθητικά 'has been assigned its own name by reason of knowledge of unspeakable mysteries' seems to be connected with the theory in *Excerpta* about the Name which all must possess and in which all must be included who are to be saved.[1] Nevertheless, there are considerable differences between the two systems, and, whereas they supply each other with tantalizing parallels in thought and in mythological detail, they are too unlike to be identified.

---

[1] The text of the manuscripts in xxxi 5. 6 (H. p. 361. 13 ff) is corrupt, but Holl's text apparently restores the right meaning.

[2] Cf. *Exc. ex Theod.* 21–22, 36, 40–41.

There are two remarkable features in the theology of this apocalypse, its originality and its non-Christian character. In spite of minor variations in the Valentinian theologies preserved in Irenaeus and Hippolytus, the outline of the story and the philosophic motives are much the same. In the apocalypse, however, the idea of unity as the goal of reality and prerequisite of salvation is more emphasized,[2] and, with it, the notion that the roots of differentiation by which unity is destroyed and salvation endangered are will and desire. In explaining separation from the divine unity by the thought that the Godhead abhorred the suspicion of a real plurality, and in pointing to a restless will, which continued to multiply the differences destructive of this unity, the author introduced novel features into Valentinian theology. No less original is his theory that the same persistent will which first stirred the Godhead from its primal calm, turned back upon its way, repaired the breach for which it was responsible, and restored, within the realm of individuals it had created, the substantial unity which was the necessary condition of divine reality.

The second peculiarity of the apocalypse is its non-Christian character. Other Valentinian schemes of salvation shew a marked Christian influence which, as the fragment in Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* iii 7. 59 shews, went back to Valentinus himself. The materials for the myths were largely borrowed from Christian tradition, and the theory of salvation was so designed as to include the story of the Passion, while giving it another meaning. Valentinus had been a Catholic, and his lapse into heresy did not involve a total renunciation but a rearrangement and resetting of Christian ideas. It is just in the doctrine of salvation that Christian influence is most marked, and it can be no accident that the author of the apocalypse, who makes so little allowance for Christian thought, should present an innovating doctrine of salvation in which the history of Sophia, with its dependent Christology,[3] has been eliminated.

[1] *Ibid.* 22. 4–6, 26, 31. 3.

[2] It receives equal emphasis only in some fragments of *Exc. ex Theod.* Cf. 2, 21–22, 31, 36.

[3] The usual Valentinian explanation of the fall was Sophia's passion, and the motive for redemption was the sympathy felt for her by the first male principle, the object of her desire. This view is criticized in *Exc. ex Theod.* 30 as destroying the impassibility of God. The author of the apocalypse escapes this charge by attributing the impulse both of creation and of redemption to Sige and by limiting the Father's share in both: cf. xxxi 5. 5, 6. 4.

In view of the simplifying character of the myth, it is natural to suggest, as Holl has done,[1] that the apocalypse represents a primitive form of Valentinian theology, but this is improbable. The almost complete elimination of Christian influence[2] is more naturally regarded as a reaction against the Catholic view that Valentinianism was a Christian heresy, a senseless mixture of Plato and the gospels. The novel features of the system are more easily explained as a cautious revision of the more usual Valentinian views than as the basis from which they were developed. Furthermore, the elaborate system of aeons, the occasional awkwardness and inconsequence with which myth and philosophy are combined, and the magical use of unintelligible jargon[3] are unmistakeable signs of theological decadence. In a period of confusion and mystification, when Gnostic literature was becoming always less meaningful as it became more fantastic, the author of the apocalypse represents an effort at once to simplify and to enrich Valentinian speculation by a new philosophy of religion, symbolized in a quaint and distinctive variety of Valentinian myth.

R. P. Casey.

A NOTE ON EP. AD DIOGNETUM X § 1.

We read in ch. x § 1 ff *ταύτην καὶ σὺ τὴν πίστιν ἐὰν ποθῇς καὶ λάβῃς πρῶτον μὲν ἐπίγνωσιν πατρός. ὁ γὰρ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠγάπησε, δι᾽ οὓς ἐποίησε τὸν κόσμον, οἷς ὑπέταξε πάντα τὰ ἐν ⟨τῇ γῇ⟩, οἷς λόγον ἔδωκεν, οἷς νοῦν, οἷς μόνοις ἄνω πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁρᾶν ἐπέτρεψεν, οὓς ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας εἰκόνος ἔπλασε, πρὸς οὓς ἀπέστειλε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, οἷς τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν ἐπηγγείλατο καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἀγαπήσασιν αὐτόν. ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ τίνος οἴει πληρωθήσεσθαι χαρᾶς; ἢ πῶς ἀγαπήσεις τὸν οὕτως προαγαπήσαντά σε;* The first sentence is clearly corrupt. Von Gebhardt has proposed *κατάλαβε* for *καὶ λάβῃς*. Should we not rather read *ἐπιγνώσῃ πατέρα*? The corruptions supposed are easy (*-ῃ* or *-ει* to *ιν*, *πρ̅α̅* to *πρ̅ς̅*), and *ἐπιγνούς* follows on *ἐπιγνώσῃ* as the required *crescendo*.[4]

A. D. Nock.

---

[1] Cf. E. Preuschen's article, 'Valentinus, Gnostiker', *Realencyclopädie für protestantischen Theologie und Kirche* xx p. 403.

[2] The elimination is not complete. The *πνεῦμα ἅγιον τὸ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν* is Christian, and *πατὴρ τῆς ἀληθείας* and *οὐτὲ ἀρχαῖς οὐτὲ ἐξουσίαις* are reminiscent of John and Paul.

[3] xxxi 6. 10, cf. xxxi 2. 8–9. Attempts to make sense of this jargon have not proved successful. Epiphanius supposed the words to be the names of aeons, but some modern critics have taken them to be Aramaic formulae. Cf. Holl's note in *Epiphanius*, vol. i p. 385.

[4] On *ἐπιγιγνώσκω, ἐπίγνωσις* a reference to a valuable paper by M. Dibelius in

HERMETICA.

To emend or explain passages in the *Corpus Hermeticum* is a difficult task, and the solutions which appear at one moment satisfying sometimes lose their attraction on further consideration.[1] I submit three notes to the readers of the Journal partly in the hope of provoking criticism which may help an edition in preparation.

v 10 p. 47. 4 Parthey = p. 164. 1 Scott τί οὖν σε εὐλογῆσαι ὑπὲρ σοῦ ἢ πρὸς σέ; πῶς δὲ καὶ βλέπων εὐλογήσω σε; is the text of the Laurentianus, Vaticani 237 and 951, Parisinus 1220, and the Vindobonensis, the text therefore of the minuscule parent of our manuscripts. Bodleiani 3388 and 3037 give τίς for τί; the *editio princeps* and a corrector of Bodl. 8827, and a very late (possibly seventeenth-century) corrector of Bodl. 16987 add δύναιτο after πρὸς σέ. Both τίς and δύναιτο must be regarded as conjectures with no more pretensions to authority than those of modern scholars; but while the first is slight and necessary, the second is violent and unnecessary. Read τίς οὖν σε εὐλογήσαι ὑπὲρ σοῦ ἢ πρὸς σέ, substituting the optative εὐλογήσαι for the infinitive εὐλογῆσαι. 'Who could praise thee in an excessive or adequate way?' Such a potential optative without ἄν is met elsewhere in the Corpus, as for instance ix 8 ὁ αὐτὸς οὖν κόσμος καὶ ἀναγκαίως καὶ οἰκείως καλοῖτο; 10 ταῦτά σοι, Ἀσκληπιέ, ἐννοοῦντι ἀληθῆ δόξειεν, ἀγνοοῦντι δὲ ἄπιστα; xi 5 τί δὲ αὐτὸς ἄλλο ποιήσειεν.[2]

xiii 9 p. 120 Parthey = p. 343 Reitzenstein = p. 244 Scott. In the account of the purgation of the soul by ten δυνάμεις we read τετάρτην δὲ νῦν καλῶ καρτερίαν, τὴν κατὰ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας δύναμιν . . . ὁ βαθμὸς οὗτος, ὦ τέκνον, δικαιοσύνης ἐστὶν ἕδρασμα. χωρὶς γὰρ κρίσεως ἰδὲ πῶς τὴν ἀδικίαν ἐξήλασεν. ἐδικαιώθημεν, ὦ τέκνον, ἀδικίας ἀπούσης. ἕκτην δύναμιν καλῶ εἰς ἡμᾶς τὴν κατὰ τῆς πλεονεξίας κοινωνίαν. Reitzenstein is clearly right in supposing a lacuna after δύναμιν; something like πέμπτην δὲ μετὰ ταύτην καλῶ δύναμιν may have stood in, and been lost through homoeoteleuton.[3] He explains βαθμόν thus: 'Die Vorstellung eines

---

Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrici dargebracht (1914) 176 ff may be of use. The fact that a commonplace of later Stoicism (that man alone of living things looks up to heaven) is here christianized has no doubt been observed by earlier students.

[1] I wish to withdraw κοινότητα in xii 7 and η' αὐτοῦ in p. 512 Scott proposed in *Journ. Eg. Arch.* xi 135, 137.

[2] For instances in earlier Greek cf. Kuehner-Gerth *Grammatik*^{3} II i 225 f; Sidgwick's appendix to his edition of the *Agamemnon* (on interrogative examples); L. Radermacher *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*^{2} 160. τίς ⟨ἂν⟩ οὖν would be easy, but, as Professor H. J. Rose kindly remarked to me, it is quite unnecessary.

[3] It will be remarked that the rhetorical principle of variation is observed in this enumeration.

stufenweisen Aufstieges oder einer stufenweisen Vervollkommung wirkt ein'. As Scott's translation 'And this, my son, is the tribunal on which Justice sits enthroned' deviates from this and supposes a less suitable metaphor it may be of service to say something on *βαθμός*. In *C. H.* i 25 the soul's return to bliss is attained by an ascent through seven planetary spheres at each of which a vice is lost. Here there is not an express ascent; but there are seven stages: seven powers enter man,[1] and are followed by the Good, Life, and Light. The ascent metaphor rests on a doctrine which has in effect shaped the passage, and the soul-ladder can therefore come in allusively.[2]

xiii 15 p. 123 Parthey = p. 345 Reitzenstein = p. 248 Scott *ἐβουλόμην ὦ πάτερ τὴν διὰ τοῦ ὕμνου εὐλογίαν ἣν ἔφης ἐπὶ τὴν ὀγδοάδα γενομένου μου ἀκοῦσαι τῶν δυνάμεων καθὼς ὀγδοάδα ὁ Ποιμάνδρης ἐθέσπισε. τέκνον καλῶς σπεύδεις λῦσαι τὸ σκῆνος· κεκαθαρμένος γάρ. ὁ Ποιμάνδρης, ὁ τῆς αὐθεντίας νοῦς, πλέον μοι τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων οὐ παρέδωκεν, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ δυνήσομαι πάντα νοεῖν καὶ ἀκούειν ὧν βούλομαι καὶ ὁρᾶν τὰ πάντα. καὶ ἐπέτρεψέ μοι ἐκεῖνος ποιεῖν τὰ καλά. διὸ καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν ἐμοὶ ᾄδουσι.* This is the reading of the MSS (apart from the variant *διὰ τὴν* in the Parisinus, which is one of the numerous alterations of word-order in the MSS of the Corpus, from the corruptions *ἀλογίαν* in the Vaticani and the Parisinus and *ἀναλογίαν* in the Laurentianus, and from *ἐγγραμμένων* in the Parisinus and one Vaticanus). Parthey and Reitzenstein make Tat's words close at *δυνάμεων* and ascribe *καθὼς . . . ἐθέσπισε*, as well as what follows, to Hermes. Reitzenstein inserts *μανθάνειν* after *εὐλογίαν*, emends *μου* to *σου*, and suggests *καθὼς* ⟨*ἀνιόντι μοι εἰς τὴν*⟩ *ὀγδοάδα*.[3] *μανθάνειν*, or Scott's *μαθεῖν* or something similar (possibly *ἀκούειν*), we must have; *σου* also seems necessary, as it is here assumed that Hermes is the recipient of the revelation in i to which reference is here made, and which he has presumably spoken to the initiate of this dialogue. Should we not do well to bracket *καθὼς ὀγδοάδα ὁ Ποιμάνδρης ἐθέσπισε*? Then the sense is clear. The hymn, according to i 26, is heard by those who have passed upwards through the planetary spheres and are purified from all their evil operations. *λῦσαι τὸ σκῆνος* fits them; it is the natural result of that purification through which the initiate of xiii has passed (*κεκαθαρμένος γάρ*). The offending words are possibly a marginal note in the nature of a cross reference[1]; possibly *ὁ Ποιμάνδρης ἐθέσπισε* is an alternative for *ἔφης*, or *καθὼς ὁ Ποιμάνδρης ἐθέσπισε* for the whole clause, *ἣν ἔφης . . . δυνάμεων*. That doublets have been combined in our tradition is almost certain in xviii 6 *λέγεται μὲν δὴ καί τινος τεχνίτου κιθαρῳδίαν διαγωνιζομένου τῆς νευρᾶς ῥαγείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος λέγεται μὲν δή τινα κιθαρῳδὸν τὸν τῆς μουσουργίας ἔφορον θεὸν ἔχοντα εὐμενῆ* and 4 *ὅτι δὴ τὸν τόνον ὑποχαλάσασα ὅτι δὴ τὸν τόνον ὑπαραίωσασα.*[2] If we regard *καθὼς ὁ Π. ἐ.* as a marginal note its inclusion may be paralleled by the fact that Vaticanus 951 includes the note of Psellus in its text of i 18.

---

[1] This has been noted earlier by J. Kroll *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos* 297 f.

[2] The idea of ascent comes also in iv 8. For general references cf. Bousset *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* xviii 145 ff; A. B. Cook *Zeus* ii 121 ff; and my note *J. H. S.* xlv 99 n. 103 (add Petrie *Amulets* 17 no. 46, for the ladder as an amulet in Egypt in dynasties XXVI to XXX; he records specimens with 9, 7, 6, and 2 steps; and *Collection Raoul Warocqué* (1916) 42 no. 74, seven-stepped ladder among objects belonging to the cult of Isis and Sarapis).

[3] Scott proposes more drastic alterations; his *διὸ αἱ ἐν πᾶσι δυνάμεις καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ ᾄδουσι* is worth consideration.

If the offending words are kept they should probably be assigned to the initiate, and regarded as one more instance of tautology in the *Corpus*. In that case *ὀγδοάδα* at least must go.

A. D. NOCK.

AN EMENDATION OF THE TEXT OF 1 MACC. iii 48.

THE text of the three great manuscripts, the readings of which are recorded in Dr Swete's edition (vol. iii p. 606), is as follows:

καὶ ἐξεπέτασαν τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου, περὶ ὧν ἐξηρεύνων τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν εἰδώλων αὐτῶν·

ἐξεπέτασεν ℵ.

Ἐκπετάζειν is not found elsewhere in the LXX for the spreading out of a roll. In 2 (4) Kings xix 14, the parallel referred to by the commentators, the word used is *ἀνέπτυξεν*. Moreover, there is no proper antecedent to *ὧν*, and *ἐξηρεύνων*, as it stands, hardly makes sense.

1. I will deal with this last word first. Something seems to be missing after *τὰ ἔθνη*. Some manuscripts (55 and 71) actually add *τοῦ ἐπιγράφειν ἐπ' αὐτῶν.*[3]

It is generally agreed that the Greek of 1 Macc. is a translation from an original Hebrew. Here then *περὶ ὧν*, no doubt, represents אשר . . . עליהן; and we may suppose that להעלות,[4] *to work upon*, has fallen out before

---

[1] *ἐθέσπισε* is not impossible; for Byzantine examples cf. Stephanus-Dindorf *Thesaurus* iv 343 (Malalas and Pseudo-Chrysostom; no further material in Ducange).

[2] Reitzenstein *Poimandres* 326.

[3] Cf. also the Syriac: 'and they spread out the roll of the law, and they were complaining before the Holy One concerning the Gentiles who were forcing them to conduct themselves after their likeness': which perhaps merely represents an attempt to supply what was felt to be missing in the LXX.

[4] Cf. 2 Chron. iii 14: And he made the veil (הפרכת) of blue, and purple, and crimson, and fine linen, and wrought cherubim thereon (ויעל עליו כרובים).

עליהן. Thus we get: אשר הגוים חקרים להעלות עליהן, *which the Gentiles were seeking in order to work upon them* (the likenesses of their idols).

2. I turn now to *ἐξεπέτασαν τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου περὶ ὧν.* Consider the theme of *vv.* 46–51. Judas Maccabaeus and his men are gathered at Mizpah (46): they fast and pray (47): they bring out the priests' garments, and the firstfruits and the tithes, and they stir up the Nazirites who have accomplished their days (and should now be shaved *in the Temple*) (49).

'And they cried aloud toward heaven, saying, What shall we do with these men, and whither shall we carry them away? And thy holy place is trodden down and profaned, and thy priests are in heaviness and brought low' (50, 51).

The pronouns in the original lying behind *τούτοις* and *αὐτούς* may have referred not to the Nazirites only but also to the things before-mentioned. If so the point would be plainer, viz. that they all ought to be brought to the Temple at Jerusalem which was now in the enemy's hands and therefore out of reach. As the text stands *τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου* is the one item which has no particular attachment to the Temple.

Now in the next chapter we read how the Temple was recaptured and cleared[1] and rededicated. And then come the following words: *καὶ ἐξεπέτασαν τὰ καταπετάσματα* (iv 51). The suggestion presents itself that on the former occasion also (iii 48) they 'spread out' not *τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου* but *τὰ καταπετάσματα.* The Hebrew translated by the present Greek text *τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου* is, no doubt, ספר התורה: if this be emended into הפרכות we have *τὰ καταπετάσματα.* It is worth notice that in the LXX apart from 1 Macc. iv 51 (and 1 Macc. iii 48 if the emendation suggested here is accepted) *καταπέτασμα* always occurs in the singular. Similarly we have no other instance in the Old Testament or the Apocrypha of פרכת in the plural.

פרכת (fem. sing.) is the word used in P of the veil in the Tabernacle which separated the Holy of Holies from the Holy Place.

Such a veil is never mentioned in connexion with Solomon's Temple[2] except in 2 Chron. iii 14, where again פרכת is used of it, and the veil in the Tabernacle is evidently in the chronicler's mind.[3]

That a veil separated the two parts of the Sanctuary in the second century B.C. is clear from Ecclus. l 5.

'How glorious was he (i.e. Simon the High Priest) when the people gathered round him

---

[1] N.B. iv 48 as well as 51.

[2] In 1 Kings vi 31, 32, doors of olive wood with cherubim carved upon them are said to have stood before the Holy of Holies.

[3] Cf. Exod. xxvi 31, 32.

At his coming forth out of the sanctuary—*ἐν ἐξόδῳ οἴκου καταπετάσματος*.' Here the Hebrew reads:

'How glorious was he when he looked forth from the tent
And when he came forth from the house of the veil—מבית הפרכת.'[1]

The use of the word פרכת seems to shew that the reference is to the veil between the Holy of Holies and the Holy Place, rather than to the veil at the entrance to the latter, which in the Old Testament is always spoken of as מסך.

What then is to be said of the *plural τὰ καταπετάσματα*? There are two possibilities:

1. That the Greek translator mistook the fem. sing. פרכת for the plural פרכות written without ו.

2. That the plural really stood in the original and is to be explained by the supposition that the partition between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, as later in the Temple of Herod the Great, at least according to the tradition preserved in the Mishna,[2] actually consisted of two veils. The outer veil is said to have been looped up on the south, the inner on the north, and the High Priest is represented as proceeding between them from south to north. There is evidence that it was a matter of dispute as to whether it was correct to speak of two veils (פרכות) in this position or of one (פרכת)[3] only. Commonly the singular was used; as for example in 1 Macc. i 22, in the New Testament, and in Josephus.[4] In Philo *καταπέτασμα* is expressly distinguished as this partition from *κάλυμμα*, the curtain that hung at the entrance to the Holy Place.[5]

In 1 Macc. iv 51, and according to reconstruction here advocated, in 1 Macc. iii 48, if the Greek translator is right, we have the rarer plural פרכות.[6]

3. I take the latter alternative as involving slightly less alteration in the text than the former, and reconstruct the Hebrew original as follows:

ויפרשו את הפרכות אשר הגוים חקרים להעלות עליהן תמונות אלהיהם

i.e. And spread out the veils which the Gentiles were seeking in order to work upon them the likenesses of their idols.

---

[1] Cf. לשכת הפרכת the chamber of the veil, Middoth i 1.

[2] Yoma v 1 (cf. Middoth iv 7; Shek. v 1).

[3] R. Joseph said, 'there was one veil only, as it is said, "the veil is the division for you between the Holy and the Holy of Holies"' (Exod. xxvi 33). Yoma v 1.

[4] *Wars* v 5 5 (219).

[5] *De vit. Mos.* iii 9 (ii 101).

[6] In either case the reference appears to be to the partition between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, rather than to the curtain at the entrance to the Holy Place. The Greek *τὰ καταπετάσματα* might in itself refer to both *καταπέτασμα*, the partition veil (as generally), and *καταπέτασμα* (Josephus *Wars* v 5 4 (212)), the outer curtain. But so far as is known these two objects are in Hebrew always denoted by two different words, פרכת and מסך, neither of which in the M.T. is found in the plural.

If this reconstruction of the text is accepted, we gather that among the alterations planned by the Gentiles in the Temple—very considerable alterations, iv 48—was the redecoration of the partition between the Holy of Holies and the Holy Place with figures of heathen deities instead of cherubim.[1] The veils, of which this partition consisted, had, however, been rescued by the Hasidaeans (ii 42); and when the Temple was recovered and purified they were restored to their original position (iv 51).

The emendation thus appears to give a satisfactory sense, and has the further advantage of removing a slight inconsistency between this passage (iii 48) and i 56. For in i 56 we are told that what the Gentiles did with the books of the law was not to turn them into illuminated manuscripts or to use them for any other purpose connected with *the likenesses of their idols*, but simply to burn them.

J. W. HUNKIN.

---

[1] 2 Chron. iii 14.

REVIEWS

The Synoptic Gospels, by C. G. MONTEFIORE. (Macmillan and Co., 1927.)

THE second edition of this Commentary will be welcomed by all students of the New Testament no less than by those for whom it is written, the adherents of a Liberal Judaism. Those of us who know our indebtedness to the first edition are glad of the opportunity of expressing our debt, and grateful for the help which the present work will give us. The new edition carries on the tradition of the old, and does for most of the Synoptic literature of the years between 1909 and the present time what the original commentary did for an earlier period. An outside judgement, on most of the work on the subject from many different points of view which can claim to be critical, is of exceptional value for New Testament studies. It is hardly necessary to add that it is based on wide reading, sympathetic appreciation of good work wherever it is to be found, and rigid seeking after impartiality, nearly always successful in its search.

The post-war literature of New Testament comment and criticism has not produced much but second or later editions. We must of course except Canon Streeter's volume on the Gospels, which really breaks new ground, and the redaction of Mandaean and Manichean parallels to Christian thought, from sources published by Lidzbarski and Reitzenstein, in Bauer's Commentary and Bultmann's Essay, which offer new parallels, but hardly substantiate the theories of common pre-Christian sources often developed from them.

Montefiore's second edition is one of the most important of its kind. The list of books 'quoted frequently or by abbreviations' is singularly impressive, and encouraging to English patriotism. It is not, of course, fair to compare it with the lists, necessarily far shorter, to be found in commentaries like those of the Handbuch, which are recommendations to the student rather than evidence of the writers' acquaintance with the relevant literature. But the list certainly suggests width of reading and outlook of which English scholarship may reasonably be proud. Few books of the period from which students have learned anything are absent from the list. It reminds us of the importance of the output of the last seventeen years, and, it is fair to add, of the advantage of fuller use and recognition of English work than is sometimes found in the best German books. And students who have had to attempt to form a working judgement on the value of the 'Vermehrte und Verbesserte' will find interest in the second sentence of Montefiore's Preface, 'The second edition has been carefully revised *and considerably changed*'.

Few pages afford pleasanter or more instructive reading than those in which the author reconsiders his former statements in the light of criticisms made on them, and modifies or maintains his former opinion after such consideration. The 'considerable change' is more considerable than in most post-war revised editions. The omission of the continuous translation leaves room for some expansion, and other omissions and reductions for more. But 'improvement' rather than 'expansion' is the obvious characteristic of the book. The new edition is as useful and serviceable a guide to the criticism of recent years as the first was to the available literature down to the year 1909. The writer makes no claim to original work, but his wide knowledge of the literature, and the use he has made of it, give his work a high place in New Testament scholarship. The impartial judgement of Liberal Judaism on recent Gospel criticism makes his two volumes one of the best approaches to the study of the Synoptic Gospels.

Die Offenbarung des Johannes, by E. LOHMEYER. (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1926.)

STUDENTS of the New Testament who read German will find in this commentary on the Apocalypse the help which they have learned to expect from the Handbuch. It contains the usual supply, full and adequate, of references to the literature of the subject, ancient and modern. It has also greater claims than some volumes of the series to independence and originality of treatment. Herr Lohmeyer is a strong supporter of the unity of the Apocalypse, and a convinced opponent of the contemporary historical method of interpretation. But he is fully aware of the varied nature of its contents. Material of many kinds, from many sources, has been collected, first of all into smaller units, then into one consistent whole, to explain the author's views of God and Christ, of the Church and the world; and to serve his purposes of edification and exhortation. But the book is one, a carefully arranged whole. Neither the winds of heaven nor the imbecilities of editors are responsible for the present arrangement of the Apocalypse. A careful examination of the general arrangement of the book, of the predominance throughout of groups of seven, and of the rhythmic structure of each paragraph, yields the indications which Herr Lohmeyer finds of this interesting, if not always convincing, attempt to explain the obvious facts of unity in diversity, which form one of the most obvious and difficult problems of the Apocalypse. He offers us a view of the book as a designed whole, which cannot in future be neglected.

The application of 'Formgeschichte' to disparage the 'Zeitgeschichtliche' method of interpretation is less convincing. Of course if every detail can be dismissed as part of some apocalyptic or other tradition, interpretation in the light of events of the writer's own time, or shortly before, is no longer necessary. It may well be the case that many details have been taken over from the various sources used by the author, and have little or no significance with reference to the events of the author's own time. The number 666 is 'triangular'; it may be equivalent in significance to 36, and that number to 8. And this latter number may be a proper symbol of demonic power. But does this exclude the probability that some particular Roman emperor, whom the author regards as the 'eighth', is present to his mind as he writes or records his vision? There is doubtless a 'common' of apocalyptic symbolism, but it is dangerous to conclude that its several details are never to be interpreted with reference to contemporary history.

But Herr Lohmeyer's work far exceeds the limits of that type of 'catena' work to which some of the numbers of this series approximate. All students will find it helpful and suggestive, as well as replete with the necessary references and summaries of other work on the subject.

Handbuch zum Neuen Testament: Das Matthäus-Evangelium, by E. Klostermann. (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1927.)

The second edition of Klostermann's Commentary on S. Matthew in the *Handbuch*, which appears seventeen years after the first, gives us a careful revision of the earlier edition in the light of the literature, more especially the German literature, of the subject which has been published in the interval. It comprises about twenty-five more pages, and further compression has made room for rather more additional matter than that number of pages suggests. The additions to the list in the preface of books used for the purpose of the Commentary include Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, two later editions of Zahn, McNeile, Lagrange; and of the newer 'Synoptic' literature Müller (1908), Bussmann (1925), W. Haupt (1913), Soiron (*Die Logia Jesu*, 1916), Fiebig (1925), Bertram. He also claims to have made regular use of the Mandaean Literature, which was hardly available for his second edition of the Commentary on S. Mark, published last year. A comparison of the two editions of 1909 and 1927 suggests recasting in view of this more recent literature, rather than substantial alteration of content or point of view. But the 'völlig neuarbeitete' of the title-page is not an idle claim. Students should consult the second edition, even if they do not buy it.

An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon, by MARTIN DIBELIUS. (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1927.)

THE same may be said of the second edition of Dibelius's Commentary on Colossians and Ephesians in the *Handbuch*, which is about twenty pages longer than the first. The note, for instance, on the Christian armour (Eph. vi 10 ff) has been lengthened by rather more than ten lines. We have references added to Philo, Apuleius, Ignatius, and also to Lidzbarski and Eisler. They add further illustrations rather than new points of view. Lohmeyer's article (*Theol. Blätter*, 1926) has afforded more additional matter on the structure of the Prologue to Ephesians. It may be doubted whether the net gain to the interpretation of these Epistles is very substantial. But the work of this kind of revision has been done with characteristic thoroughness and patience.

Das Neue Testament: übersetzt und erklärt von OSKAR HOLTZMANN. (Giessen, Tönelmann, 1925, 1926.)

THE appearance of the third part of Oskar Holtzmann's 'einbändige Erklärung' completes his short commentary on the whole New Testament, which aims at enabling 'Pastors and Religious Teachers' to fufil their duty of studying the New Testament. 'No one should be either Pfarrer or Religious Teacher in Higher Schools who has not read the whole of his New Testament in Greek.'

The books of the New Testament are arranged in the order in which they should be studied. Mark as 'Quelle' precedes Matthew and Luke, and Acts follows, because it forms one whole with Luke. Next come the Epistles of Paul 'in their historical order', except that 2 Thess. and Ephesians, the 'spurious doubles' of 1 Thess. and Colossians, follow their archetypes. The Pastorals and Hebrews close the Pauline section; it was only as 'Pauline' that they were included in the New Testament.

Then come the Catholic Epistles, including 1–3 John, which are placed last in the group. And the two great Johannine writings, Apocalypse and Gospel, form, in their historical sequence, the close of the Canon. The order differs only slightly from that of Johannes Weiss' 'Schriften des N. T.' So the Christian developement of the Gospel from Mark to John reaches its climax within the limits of our N. T. in the Spiritual Gospel. The same form is maintained throughout—a short paragraph more or less literally translated, followed by a short explanation. The work is thoroughly done, and clearly expressed. The writer presents, didactically as circumstances require, to the Pfarrer and the School

Teacher, the 'common' of his school and period. Only occasionally does he give up space to private and more conjectural interpretations of his own. The introduction contains a short statement on the character and content of each book.

A. E. BROOKE.

The Poetry of our Lord: an Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ, by the Rev. C. F. BURNEY, M.A., D.Litt. (Oxford University Press, 1925.)

STIMULATING as was Dr Burney's earlier work on the *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, this volume—published some four months before the death of its author—will serve more adequately to shew how great might have been the gain to scholarship had Dr Burney lived longer to apply his conspicuous fertility of ideas, and his deep Semitic learning, to the investigation of New Testament questions. The degree to which the essential features of Hebrew poetry are present in the discourses of our Lord impressed itself upon Dr Burney in the course of his studies for the volume on the Fourth Gospel, but as the subject had to be treated in relation to all four Gospels it was properly reserved by him for separate discussion.

The grammatical and syntactical points upon which Dr Burney relied for his argument concerning the Fourth Gospel are admittedly interesting, but were felt by many 'to go but a little way towards proving that that Gospel is translated from an Aramaic original'. Nevertheless it may be remarked that some years earlier Dr Rendel Harris had shewn how inexplicable is the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel except as a translation from an Aramaic original, and if many of the points stressed by Dr Burney are but details, some of them appear to be facts which claim recognition. Doubtless the complexities of which the criticism of the Fourth Gospel must take account are great and many-sided; but they will not be unravelled by brushing aside real factors in the problem, however small. The present volume serves to strengthen Dr Burney's argument concerning the Gospel by its investigation of various important passages in the discourses; and certainly the smooth *perfection* with which they retranslate, not merely into Aramaic prose, but into easy, rhythmic parallelisms, most powerfully conveys the impression that in this Aramaic poetic diction we must assuredly perceive the original form of these discourses.

But it is more important to stress the fact that the argument of the present volume is independent of the strength or weakness of Dr Burney's plea for an Aramaic Fourth Gospel. Much that he has to say here only needs to be brought into the foreground for its value to be apparent. 'Considerable portions of our Lord's sayings and discourses', he affirms, 'are cast in the characteristic forms of Hebrew poetry': i.e. in parallelism, with distinctive rhythms. Thus, retranslated, the rhythm is perfect in (e.g.)

Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat
Neither for your body, what ye shall put on
(Luke xii 22, Matt. vi 25);

Ye build the sepulchres of the prophets,
And adorn the tombs of the righteous (Matt. xxiii 29).

This indeed is obvious enough, but when Dr Burney proceeds to bring out the extent to which it is true (and that in respect of the discourses in all the Gospels), no one whose ear is trained to note and appreciate the instinctive forms and rhythms of Hebrew speech at its highest can fail to be moved by the evidence unfolded: Dr Burney has transformed the obvious into a discovery. We realize that our Lord would surely have spoken poetically, in the very tones that belong naturally to the Prophets and Psalmists of His race.

In recent years, thanks largely to the work of the late Dr Buchanan Gray, the essential facts of Hebrew rhythm have been settled with sufficient definiteness to afford Dr Burney a stable basis for his argument; and, although we lack Aramaic poetry of our Lord's time, it can be shewn adequately from passages in Daniel and Rabbinic Hebrew, that the same principles held good as in the classical Hebrew period. Dr Burney devotes part of his book to the most lucid and satisfactory brief statement of the nature of Hebrew poetry—parallelism, rhythm, and *rhyme*—that has yet appeared. In this connexion notice may be called to his probably sound conclusion that 'where a compound term (e.g. in Num. xxiii 7, *melek* Mō'āb), which would normally take two stresses, is parallel to a simple stressed term (Bālāk), the sense of correspondence between the two was powerful enough to allow the former to be allotted one stress only'. In his treatment of *rhyme* he shews interestingly that, although it is rare or deliberately avoided in the higher literary poetry, it was much more common in primitive and popular verse (Song of Songs), and in the Wisdom Books was more elaborate (Prov. and Ecclus.), than is usually recognized. Incidentally he notes a proof that the Massoretic pausal system is not a late invention but primitive (p. 155 n.).

Thereafter Dr Burney proceeds to examine in detail the use of parallelism and rhythm in our Lord's discourses. A curious point may be mentioned regarding one of the passages instanced. In Matt. vii 6 the parallelism is clear, yet not perfectly regular in the received text.

How it would have appealed to Dr Burney to know that in a forthcoming edition of an 'Old Hebrew MS of St Matthew' by H. Schonfield,[1] the passage appears with just that addition which obviously makes the parallelism complete: thus,

> Do not gíve that which is hóly to the dógs,
> Neíther cást ye your peárls before swíne;
> Lest they trámple upon thém with their féet,
> And (*the dógs*) túrn and rénd you.

(Similarly Matt. vii 1, 2, where the parallelism is imperfect in the received text, appears in Mr Schonfield's text precisely as it does in Luke vi 36–38, where the parallelism is exact.)

From his survey Dr Burney claims that certain important conclusions emerge. First, that 'as close conformity to parallelism and rhythm is abundantly evidenced for the discourses of our Lord not in one but in all of the Gospel sources (in Matt. and Q frequently, in the matter peculiar to Luke, and most markedly of all in the Fourth Gospel) this is conclusive evidence that our Lord did so frame his teaching' (p. 83). And it follows that 'we have a strong argument for substantial authenticity. For the alternative is that the different authors of the sources, if they possessed merely a vague recollection or tradition of the sayings, must have set themselves, one and all, to dress them in a parallelistic and rhythmical form; and that various writers and in fact all writers to whom we owe records of our Lord's teaching, should have essayed independently to do the same thing, and so doing should have produced results which are essentially identical in form, is surely out of the question'. This conclusion is intensely important, and it is hard to see how it can be gainsaid. Certainly it seems as if it must be admitted in regard to the Synoptists. But, second, Dr Burney urges that his evidence implies equally the substantial authenticity of the discourses recorded in the Fourth Gospel. He feels that the striking differences of style between these and the simpler teaching in the Synoptists is fully accounted for by difference of audience and occasion—'simple Galilean peasants on the one hand, Rabbinic disputants at Jerusalem on the other'. Those who on wider grounds will find special difficulty in accepting Dr Burney's argument here may perhaps discover a way out of the dilemma through a loophole which Dr Burney himself indicates: namely, that sayings in Pirke Aboth and Jewish prayers of the period go to shew that the rhythmic style was felt suitable for religious speech or instruction in this period.

---

[1] Shortly to be published by T. and T. Clark. The MS in question proves to be not a polemical Rabbinic version, but rests on a remarkable early text, containing some very interesting variants.

Obviously, however, Dr Burney's view—that the characteristic form of our Lord's utterance has been preserved in St John even as in the Synoptists—is the natural interpretation. However that may be, it can fairly be insisted that by his investigation of the Johannine passages in question he has shewn from yet one more angle how fundamentally Semitic the Fourth Gospel is.

Thirdly, from a comparison of certain passages in Matthew, Luke, and Mark he concludes that 'Matthew and Luke were not always dependent upon Mark alone but had access to a source which was in some respects more original . . . (Q)', and again that 'Mark also knew Q, and to some extent employed it, and in the passages in question *glossed its contents*'. Thus on grounds of parallelism and rhythm *combined* it seems irresistibly clear that in Mark viii 35 the phrase 'and the Gospel's' is a gloss inserted by Mark: see also the discussion of Mark x 27, xiv 7, on p. 85 f, and cp. p. 141 n. Lastly, on the question whether Matthew or Luke has preserved the more original form of Q, the instances considered amount virtually to demonstration that as a rule Matthew is the more faithful: 'the characteristic forms of parallelism standing in Matthew are often so modified in Luke as to destroy their form'. And the reason is to hand: for no doubt 'to Luke with his Greek training (or with Greek readers in mind) the Synonymous and Antithetical forms of parallelism appeared an unattractive redundancy, so that for stylistic reasons he deliberately altered their form while retaining their substance'.

It will be seen that this book raises large issues, which challenge the attention of all who are seriously interested in the criticism of the New Testament. The issues are highly controversial, but at least the argument rises out of a firm fact, the significance of which requires to be weighed, namely, that large parts of the recorded discourses of our Lord translate *directly* and, as it were, inevitably, into rhythmical Aramaic. By a *tour de force* a scholar might perhaps produce some rendering of the general sense of (say) St Paul's Epistles in Aramaic verse. That would be a radically different thing from the arresting facts to which Dr Burney's work calls our attention.

But apart from these important topics, the book will repay study, if only for the numerous details of readings in the Gospels which it illuminates. Again and again where it is a question of variants in parallel passages in the Gospels, the combined criteria of Parallelism and Rhythm seem quite decisive one way or the other. Particularly interesting are the notes on the Lord's Prayer (p. 112); on Mark xiii 9–13 (apparently on rhythmical grounds a misplaced section, perhaps from Q, and paralleled not in Matt. xxiv 9–14, but in Matt. x 17–22; see p. 118 f); and on the Beatitudes (pp. 166–168).

It should be mentioned that Dr Burney very sensibly transliterates his Aramaic renderings; so that the gist of the argument can be followed readily by those unacquainted with Aramaic—e. g. Matt xvi 17 ff, in the 4-beat rhythm apparently characteristic of a Rabbi addressing his disciples (cp. Pirke Aboth)—

Blessed thóu, Simʿón,   thou són of Jónah,
For flésh and blóod   revéaled not to thée
Bút my Fáther   Who ís in héaven—

tūbáyk Šimʿṓn   b^{e}rḗh d^e Yōnā́
d^e bisrā́ ūd^{e}mā́   lā gálē lák
'ellā́ 'abbā́   d^e'īt hū́ bišmayyā́.

He modestly suggests in the Preface that in essaying an Aramaic rendering of so much of our Lord's discourses he has been very bold, and may have been guilty of errors. He asks 'that conviction of errors in rendering may be set against his own competence, and not against the validity of the method which he has attempted to follow'. His competence none will question: if any errors there be, they are at most of trifling moment. It is to be hoped that his wish may be fulfilled that the fresh line of study which this work—his last gift to us—opens up will be developed. His conclusions are too important to be ignored; they ought to be controverted or accepted.

W. A. L. Elmslie.

Christianity according to St Paul, by Charles A. Anderson Scott. (Cambridge, 1927.)

Dr Anderson Scott builds up his interpretation of the Apostle's teaching around the idea of *σωτηρία*, which he finds to be central in the Apostle's thought. '*σωτηρία*, salvation or deliverance, was and is what is sought and offered in all religions of the higher form. The true differentia between them lies in that from which deliverance is sought and effected, and in the means, whether magical or moral, whereby it is accomplished.' The four central chapters of the book are devoted to a full examination of the meaning and implications of the idea in St Paul. Salvation, as the Apostle knew it, was grounded upon the historic death and resurrection of Christ which had won for men redemption from Evil Spirits, from the bondage of the Law, and from the servitude of sin, and made possible their reconciliation to God. It was appropriated by Faith, which must first be evoked by the preaching of the word. Thereupon it was experienced as a new principle of life creating fresh standards and capacities of ethical attainment in the fellowship of the redeemed. Though founded upon a reconciliation with God, which is already complete, salvation cannot be fully realized in the world: the redeemed still look for the redemption of the body, and 'righteousness', though in one sense a present possession, may yet be spoken of as an object of hope. In his concluding chapter Dr Scott shews how the Apostle's Christology coheres with his doctrine of salvation.

Dr Scott's well-proportioned study of St Paul's teaching keeps in view the strangely divergent interpretations of his teaching which have found acceptance in modern times, and aims at correcting one-sided views by a more comprehensive survey of his thought. 'The Protestant interpretation has been too largely governed by the form which Luther's experience assumed.' Reconciliation rather than Justification is St Paul's main theme. Perhaps the most important and original element in Dr Scott's book is his proposed amendment of the traditional exegesis of the classical passage Romans iii 21–26. He argues with great effect that the conception that Christ's death was necessary in order to vindicate God's justice, which otherwise might be impugned, has no place in St Paul's thought and rests upon misunderstanding of Rom. iii 21–26. 'The righteousness of God' in that passage, as in ch. i 17, means the status to which men are admitted, not the abstract quality of righteousness in God himself. No other biblical passage supports the idea that were it not for Christ's death, God's righteousness would be in question, and the expressions in Rom. iii 21–26 which *prima facie* imply that conception may be otherwise interpreted. διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν means 'with a view to the remission', not 'because of the passing over', and εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ means 'with a view to *the communication* (*not* the demonstration) of a Divine righteousness'.

Holding fast to the indubitably Pauline doctrine that Salvation is appropriated by Faith and through Faith becomes operative in life, Dr Scott holds that the theory which would see in St Paul the only begetter of Catholic Sacramentalism must be dismissed. Neither historical probability nor linguistic evidence supports the hypothesis that the Apostle was influenced by the mystery cults in his teaching as to the Sacraments. The Sacraments have their due place in St Paul's thoughts but they are not central. They 'seal', express, and confirm, but they do not originate, spiritual relationships. Dr Scott makes some pertinent criticisms of the theories of Reitzenstein and others, but his own exposition of St Paul's conception of Baptism does not seem to me to follow quite naturally from the texts which he quotes and discusses. 'St Paul saw in Baptism the normal but not necessary, the helpful but not indispensable sign and seal put upon the act of faith appropriating the gift of God in Christ.' 'Normal but not necessary'—would St Paul have appreciated the problems or the attitude which lie behind this antithesis? When men wished to become Christians, they did so by being baptized. The experiences of redemption naturally associated themselves with the rite. 'As many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death. We then were buried with him through baptism into death that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life.' But Dr Scott draws a distinction. Baptism for St Paul, he says repeatedly, is a sign or seal of something *which has already taken place*. This was certainly the Pauline theory of circumcision, for Abraham 'received the sign of circumcision, as a seal of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised' (Rom. iv 11), and Dr Scott, who regards circumcision and baptism as analogous, feels justified in ascribing to St Paul the same theory in regard to Baptism. But did St Paul regard Circumcision and Baptism as analogous? He never says so, and his references to Baptism suggest a quite different attitude. Moreover St Paul's usage of the metaphor of 'sealing' in relation to Christians does not support Dr Scott. For, on Dr Scott's theory, the Baptismal waters ought to be the 'seal' upon the antecedent gift of the Spirit. But this is not the Pauline usage. When Christians are spoken of as 'sealed', the slightly depreciatory nuance of σφραγίς in Rom. iv 11 is not present. The 'sealing' is directly associated with the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. i 22; Eph. i 13, iv 30). This is what we should expect. Controversy with Judaism impelled St Paul to disengage from its outward signs the faith which lay behind the ordinances of the Jewish Church. But in the case of Baptism in Christ's name such discrimination was not felt to be necessary. In a young and expanding society the outward and the inward, symbol and reality, are united in natural accord. The problems of sacramental theory belong to a later stage in the Church's life.

But Dr Scott brings out the main point. The outward rite as such is not in the centre of the Pauline theology. God sent Paul not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, and we are indebted to Dr Scott for a very valuable exposition of the Gospel which Paul preached.

ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. *Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, by ERICH FASCHER. (Töpelmann, Giessen, 1927.)

HERR FASCHER's five learned chapters (224 pages) review the usage of the word προφήτης and its cognates in Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Greek writers. He shews that in Classical Greek προφήτης (and its equivalent ὑποφήτης) means 'Verkünder', one who proclaims. Often, though not always, a religious association clings to the word. The προφήτης is the mouthpiece of a deity. In Classical Greek προφήτης never by itself means one who predicts. In the second chapter there is a discussion of the remarkable use of προφήτης as a Greek translation of an Egyptian priestly title—*hm-ntr*. It is suggested that the usage originated at Egyptian oracles, where a priest may be supposed to have discharged the function of a Greek προφήτης, and that later the word was applied to other priests at other shrines, where it was not strictly appropriate. In the LXX προφήτης is the standing translation of נביא. Fascher compares the Greek and the Hebrew conceptions of inspiration and prophecy, illustrating the wider significance of prophecy in Hebrew religion and the new meanings which, in consequence, attached to προφήτης and προφητεύειν. Chapters iv and v examine the evidence of the N.T. and of the early Greek patristic writers down to and including Origen.

Fascher's interpretations of the texts do not invariably convince. It seems very doubtful, for instance, whether the usage of προφήτης as an equivalent for an Egyptian priestly office referred to above has any bearing on the interpretation of Did. xiii 3. The passage surely carries the straightforward meaning that the prophets in the Church have the same right to firstfruits which the priests enjoyed under the Levitical law. On p. 168 Fascher regards the use of χρηματίζειν 'to convey a divine message' as distinctively Christian. A reference to Grimm-Thayer shews that the usage is also known in profane Greek. But in general the work is carried out with the thoroughness characteristic of German work, and though Herr Fascher sometimes accepts too readily a fashionable hypothesis as a proved conclusion (e.g. on the Mandaeans and their alleged relation to John the Baptist), this does not seriously interfere with the value to students of the material which he has assembled.

J. M. CREED.

Messe und Herrenmahl: eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie; by HANS LIETZMANN. (Marcus & Weber, Bonn, 1926.)

THIS is an important book, the fruit of many years study to which Dr Lietzmann found himself led by his work on Peter and Paul at Rome. His professed object is to ascertain the liturgical usage of the Apostolic Church in connexion with the Eucharist; and his method is to work back through a comparison of the various types of Liturgy to what may be regarded as the earliest type, in which he proposes to find at least an approximation to the Apostolic, and so an instrument for its reconstruction and interpretation. He has found it necessary to confine his analytical comparison to the central elements in each of the Liturgies, those which have specifically to do with the Eucharist. Within these limits he compares most of the familiar types, Eastern and Western, taking each section in turn, the Words of Institution, the Anamnesis, the Epiklesis, the Offertory, and the Eucharistic Prayer. These sections he prints shewing by typographical devices the material common to more types than one. He confirms the view that the Anamnesis in the Church Order of Hippolytus can be recovered verbatim from the Apostolic Constitutions; and that it is the basis of, rather than an excerpt from, the latter, appears from the precisely formulated contents, in which there is no word too many, from the absence of any connexion with the Baptismal Creed, and from the fact that only the Death and Resurrection of Christ are mentioned (p. 57). The Πλήρωσον-Epiklesis before the Words of Institution is typically and originally Egyptian (p. 76). Within the first three centuries the Eucharist was conceived as a sacrifice in three senses. As forming the matter of the sacrifice were recognized, first the prayers, then the Bread and Wine as laid by the congregation or individual members of it upon the altar, thirdly, the sacred action at the altar itself regarded as an analogue to the sacrificial death of Christ (p. 82). 'Above all let us be on our guard against reading into the [Hippolytean] Epiklesis an unexpressed prayer for a change of the elements' (p. 177).

Comparing the two types in their earliest and simplest forms he finds in Hippolytus a liturgy which is grouped round the recitation of the narrative of institution and presents the Lord's Supper as a rite commemorating the Death and Resurrection, and 'in a second act' contemplates this rite as a sacrifice and a sacrificial meal. In Serapion, on the other hand, the rite is treated from beginning to end as a sacrifice. But the sacrifice consists, in contrast to later ideas, in the laying of the elements on the Lord's Table and in their subsequent consecration through prayer. It is explained in what follows as a representation of the sacrifice offered by Jesus on Calvary: the bread is offered to God as a sacrifice, as Christ once offered His body. The original type of this liturgy had no narrative of the institution; and its sacrificial conception did not go beyond the contemplation of the gifts laid upon the altar and the prayers pronounced over them. This was the 'living' and 'unbloody' sacrifice of the Christians.

In the closing sections of the book (pp. 211 ff), in which Lietzmann sets himself to ascertain the original form and significance of the rite in the Apostolic Church, he reverses his process and begins with the earliest documentary evidence, which he finds in Mark and Paul. If it cannot be said that he has much that is new to offer to those who have been following recent discussions on the subject, he certainly emphasizes and combines in a remarkable way many of the results which have been provisionally arrived at,—the Last Supper not a Passover (*pace* Dalman and also Billerbeck) but a Kiddush; the rite originally confined to the breaking of bread; the prominence of the new-covenant idea; Paul and Mark representing the same tradition, though Paul has given to it a significant development; 'he is the creator of the second type'. He comes thus to Hippolytus, in whose *Church Order* he finds with only slight modifications the ritual expression of the oldest form of Eucharistic doctrine.

Kirchengeschichte, by KARL MÜLLER: erster Band, zweite Lieferung: zweite völlig neubearbeitete Auflage (Mohr, Tübingen, 1927).

THIS, the second section of the first volume of Müller's new edition, has followed the first after an interval of two years (*J. T. S.*, xxvii p. 311). Like the first it is practically a new work, and on a considerably larger scale than the earlier edition. This section deals with the Church as the Church of the Empire, with the early stages of the Arian controversy, and has a specially valuable chapter on the 'popular religion'. In the treatment of Eucharistic conceptions there is evidence, as the author says, of the influence of Lietzmann's work, which was not available for the first section (p. 503). We can only echo the author's earnest wish that he may be able ere long to issue the third Lieferung completing the first volume.

C. ANDERSON SCOTT.

Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era: The age of the Tannaim, by GEORGE FOOT MOORE. 2 vols. xii + 552, 487 pages. (Cambridge [U.S.A.], Harvard University Press, 1927.)

THIS is a large and important book by Professor G. F. Moore, who is perhaps best known to English readers by the valuable commentary on Judges which he contributed to the International Critical Commentary (Second Edition, 1898). Dr Moore's new work covers a vast field. It contains in fact in two volumes of about 1,000 pages an accurate presentation of material which otherwise has to be painfully collected from the twelve volumes of the Jewish Encyclopedia, from R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, and from the works of S. Schechter, Israel Abrahams, H. L. Strack, and others. Besides these Dr Moore has evidently made great use of the original authorities, such as Josephus and Philo, Mishnah and Midrash. The result is a comprehensive work: though the title suggests two centuries only, the book throws a flood of light on four centuries of Jewish history, roughly, from 200 B.C. to A.D. 200.

The period is one of astonishing contrast between the political history of the Jews and their religious history. On the one side stand the political chiefs of Judaism—heroes utterly ruthless in war. Judas the Maccabee who 'burnt the towers of the place with all that were therein' (1 Macc. v 5), John Hyrcanus who destroyed Samaria and even obliterated all traces of the city, Alexander Jannaeus who after victory in civil war crucified 800 of his prisoners in Jerusalem; such are the politically significant figures of the two centuries which preceded the beginning of the Christian era. In the first century A.D. we meet the Zealots and the Robbers who made the Jewish revolt of the years 67–70 an episode of wanton and purposeless bloodshed. And in the second century came the revolts in Palestine and the Eastern Mediterranean, when the generals of Hadrian repaid the Jews with massacre for massacre and turned the Holy City into Aelia of the Capitoline Jove.

But even while the Zealots and the assassins were making Jerusalem a shambles, a great religious reform was in progress. In Alexandria a generation earlier Philo had made known in the Greek tongue the moral value of the Hebrew revelation. And even before Jerusalem fell before the arms of Titus in 70 A.D. Johanan ben Zakkai ('John the son of Zacchaeus') had been carried out of the city concealed in a coffin (*sic*) in order to found a fresh centre for Judaism at Jamnia (Jabneh) in the maritime plain of Judaea. According to the *Aboth dĕ R. Nathan* Johanan obtained leave from 'Espasyanos' (Vespasian) himself to found the school. If any such permission was given the Romans decided wisely. The men who turned the minds of Israel to a minute study of the Written and Unwritten Law were not likely to breed warlike Maccabees.

Judas and his brothers were patriots and heroes, but when they took to the hills and drew the sword they set an example which men of a coarser breed were glad to follow. The Robbers, λῃσταί, who were the curse of Palestine in the first century A.D. cloaked their misdeeds with a profession of patriotism, and (quite probably) considered themselves the successors of the Maccabees.

The faith of the men who in spite of the welter of crime around them set up their standard at Jamnia and showed that they did not despair of the Republic of God deserves our highest admiration. Perhaps Dr Moore in his chapter entitled 'Reorganization at Jamnia' hardly rises to the greatness of his theme. To the ordinary Jew the burning of the Second Temple and the pollution of the site by the profane soldiery of Titus were calamities altogether beyond repair. But Johanan ben Zakkai (the man of the coffin) took the spiritual view which he had learned from the prophets. 'Woe unto us', said one of his disciples, 'because it lieth waste, even the place where they made atonement for the sins of Israel.' 'My son', replied Johanan, 'let it not grieve thee: we have another (*lege* אחרת) atonement which is equal to it. What is that? The doing of acts of mercy: for it is written, *I desire mercy and not sacrifice* (Hos. vi 6).' Dr Moore (ii 172) gives 'we have *one* (אחת) atonement', but the other reading is to be preferred.

Why did Judaism survive the destruction of the Temple and the cessation of the sacrifices? 'It survived', Dr Moore answers, 'because it succeeded in achieving a unity of belief and observance among Jews in all their wide dispersion then (i.e. at the beginning of the Christian era) and since' (i 110). Below on the same page he writes, 'The ground of this remarkable unity is to be found not so much in a general agreement in fundamental ideas as in community of observance throughout the whole Jewish world. Wherever a Jew went he found the same system of domestic observance in effect'. These remarks are true and noteworthy, but the explanation hardly goes deep enough. Whence came a 'unity of belief and observance'? Surely it was derived from the ancient religious literature of the Jews. For at least two hundred years before the catastrophe of the Temple at Jerusalem Judaism had possessed a Bible. Whether the canon of that Bible was exactly the same as that which Jerome knew is a relatively unimportant question. The great fact is that at the beginning of the Christian era the Jewish religion had become the religion of a Book; no one who studies the New Testament, Philo, Josephus, and 1 Maccabees can doubt it. It is true that a large part of the Book is devoted to regulations for sacrificial worship, but utterances at the same time more human and more divine were heard issuing from it. In it the voices of the prophets were heard telling that the First Temple had also been destroyed by the heathen, and that JEHOVAH had nevertheless comforted and restored His people. Established at Jamnia the Jewish leaders still taught the *Hălāchah*, rules of the Mosaic Law as far as it could still be observed, but in that age of supreme sorrow they had also the *Haggādah*, teaching from the prophets full of comfort and promise for the people of God. Surely it was the union of *Hălāchah* and *Haggādah*, both resting ultimately upon the Old Testament, which carried the Jewish people safely through the fiery trial of the days of Vespasian and Hadrian. The Synagogue, as an external institution, contributed its share to the result, for in the Synagogue the Scriptures were studied and discussed.

Dr Moore rightly emphasizes the basic assumption of Judaism that to Moses the complete revelation was given once for all. 'Religion perfect from the beginning and therefore unalterable.' 'To change the customs' (ἀλλάσσειν τὰ ἔθη), if such a deed were possible, meant the end of religion (Acts vi 14).

The chief doctrine of Judaism is of course Monotheism. 'Jewish Monotheism was reached', says Dr Moore, 'neither by postulating the unity of nature nor by speculation on the unity of Being—but by way of the unity of the moral order in the history of the world, identified with the will and purpose of God.' The great fear of the Jewish theologians of this epoch was of using any expressions which seemed to assume the existence of 'two authorities' (שתי רשויות). The plural form of the word *Elohim* used in Gen. i 1, 26, Exod. xx 1 *et passim*, was a constant source of discussion. Under the fear of admitting duality the Mishnah (*Megillah* iv 9) forbids even the use of such an expression as 'We give thanks, we give thanks' (מודים מודים, repeated) lest it should be supposed that thanks were being offered to two Beings. Perhaps it was this fear of acknowledging (implicitly) another 'authority', that led to the formulation of the dogma that angels have no permanent existence:—'R. Ḥelbo said in the name of R. Samuel bar Naḥman, Never doth any company of heaven (כת של מעלה) give praise and repeat its praises, but every day the Holy One (Blessed be He!) createth a new company of angels, and lo! they repeat a new song and perish' (והולכין להם, *Breshith R.* ch. lxxviii 1). On this dogma Dr Moore quotes the dialogue of Andaryanos (Hadrian) with R. Joshua ben Hananiah, who answers the mocking emperor with mockery of his own.

Dr Moore condemns emphatically the opinion that the term *Memra* (מימרא) as used in the Targums corresponds to Philo's *Logos* and is used to describe a personal intermediary between God and the world. M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim* s. v., accepts the meaning of the hypostatized word, but Dr Moore prefers the view of Strack-Billerbeck (on John i 1) that the Memra is 'ein inhaltsloser, rein formalhafter Ersatz für das Tetragramm'. *Memra*, he says, is frequently a word of command, as in the translation of the idiomatic *peh*, 'command' (lit., 'mouth') of men or of God. In the same sense it is used in such circumlocutions as 'Ye have contemned the command (*Memra*) of the Lord whose presence (*Shĕkīnah*) abides among you' for 'ye have contemned the Lord who is among you (Num. xi 20)'. Dr Moore's explanation of some passages of the Targum sounds forced (i 418, 9).

The problem of the Origin of Sin pressed of course upon the sternly monotheistic Rabbоth, but they handled it with courage, as appears in what they say of the *yēçer ha-ra'*. When God saw all that he had made, and behold it was very good (Gen. i 31), the whole nature of man is included in this judgement, as R. Samuel b. Nahman observes: '*And behold it was very good.* Lo, the evil impulse! (*yeçer ha-ra^{c}*). Is then the evil impulse very good? A wonder! Yet were it not for the evil impulse no man would build a house, nor marry a wife, nor engage in buying and selling' (*Breshith R.* ix 7).

Over ninety pages of Dr Moore's book are suitably devoted to a description of the varied sources, Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, Jewish, Christian, and heathen, from which the subject-matter is drawn. He considers that the Apocalypses and Pseudepigrapha have been overvalued as authorities for the condition of Judaism at this period: he himself would (surely rightly) attach more importance to the Hebrew and Aramaic sources—to Mishnah and Midrash. He singles out *Breshith Rabbah*, the Midrash on Genesis, for special praise, quoting from J. Theodor in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*: 'This Midrash is eminently rich in sublime thoughts and finely worded sentences, in all kinds of parables, in foreign words, especially Greek, used freely and intentionally for the sake of elegance of diction.' This praise is in the main well earned, though we may demur over the suggestion that Greek words in Hebrew letters add elegance to Midrashic style.

Among his authorities Dr Moore rightly reckons the Synoptic Gospels. The censure that they pass on religious leaders is 'directed against persons or classes, and does not convey an implicit criticism of Judaism itself. The whole point of the scathing denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees is that they are not true to the religion they profess'. On 'The Historian of the Jews' Dr Moore has an unfavourable opinion. 'For the religion of his times', he writes, 'Josephus is a somewhat disappointing source.' And again, 'Josephus like most of the aristocratic priesthood to which he belonged had little interest in religion for its own sake'. Perhaps this accounts for the fact that in the *Jewish War* he seems in his account of the Maccabees and of Herod to be following an earlier author whose point of view 'is that of an outsider not at all prepossessed in favour of the Jews, and particularly not of the Pharisees'.

In a work of this kind and particularly in a work authenticated by a mass of references some misprints must escape the eye of the most vigilant of proof-correctors. A short list of *Corrigenda* is given in vol. ii page 487. Some additions should be made to it. Vol. i p. 59, note 5 is obscurely worded: there is no indication that it is the reading Ασιδαιων (for Ιουδαιων) that is in question. Pp. 74, line 9, 'the allied forces *of the Romans*' is awkwardly put. P. 83, note 2, the reference to 'Abot de-R Nathan c. 4' is too vague: to which of the two recensions of Schechter's edition does the note refer? P. 213 εὐσέβεια (accent misplaced). P. 64, line 23 'Alexandra, being fanatically religious'. This rendering follows Niese's reading, *σεσοβημένη περὶ τὸ θεῖον*, but the MS support is very slight, and surely notice should have been taken of the common reading of the MSS, *σεβομένη τὸ θεῖον*. P. 71, note 6 a *Teth* is printed for *Mem*. P. 108, note 1 *Cassius Dio* should be *Dio Cassius* as on p. 349. Vol. ii page 216 read 'R. Eleazar' (ben Pedat),—so the *Corrigenda*—but also strike out 'a disciple of Akiba'.

On the whole it seems that the printing of the work leaves very little to be desired. It is clear and accurate. One dislikes, however, such forms as 'Asmonaeans' and 'Asidaeans'. Dr Moore gives *Hasidim* correctly in another place. Some of the author's English (it must be said) is unworthy of his book, such words e.g. as 'jural' (i 279); 'Pharisaean' (280); 'revamped' (127); 'miscegenation' (406); 'exorbitance' (ii 214); the 'fondling of God ... in non-liturgical prayer' (229); 'behave deceptively' (259). It is a pity that such blemishes were admitted in a book so valuable and (otherwise) attractive as Dr Moore's. Few writers could have given us in a thousand pages so satisfactory a view of a subject so large and so varied.

A History of the Jewish People, by MAX L. MARGOLIS and ALEXANDER MARZ. (Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1927.)

THE range of this work of 823 pages may be judged from a small selection of entries from the chapter headings. Chapter i The beginnings of the People (2000–1225 B.C.); ch. xxiv From Persian rule to Greek; ch. xxxiv The Makers of the Mishnah; ch. xxxvii Under the Sassanians; ch. xxxix The Karaite Schism; ch. xlv The Jews of Spain under Romans, Goths and Mohammedans; ch. li Rashi and his school; ch. liv The Jews of England (1066–1290); chh. lxii, lxiii The Marranos: The Expulsion from Spain and Portugal; ch. lxvi Baruch Spinoza; ch. lxxv Sabbatai Zevi (Smyrna, Jerusalem, Egypt, and Constantinople); ch. lxxviii Moses Mendelsohn; ch. xciv Zionism; ch. xcviii The Palestinian Mandate.

The Biblical section of the history has naturally to be told briefly and authoritatively. There is no room for discussions. But the work is well done under these limitations. Take for instance the description of affairs in Judah *circ.* 520 B.C. 'The commotion (in the Persian empire) communicated itself to Jerusalem. Sheshbazzar was dead. His nephew Zerubbabel slipped into his place. He was encouraged by the prophet Haggai to start the building of the Temple, and to hold himself in readiness for kingly station. Saner elements in the community, fearful of evil consequences, were satisfied to vest the headship in the high priest, Joshua. The prophet Zechariah counselled a dual headship, at the same time curbing the ambitions of Zerubbabel, who was admonished to trust not in power or might, but in the spirit. The lamp of God was to be fed from two spouts' (page 120).

This, it must be allowed, is a reasonable reconstruction of the history from the fragmentary notices we possess. Space does not allow the editors to notice other possible reconstructions.

Another interesting passage deals with the rise of the Christian Church. 'There too (at Antioch) the new religion was created when the scruples of the conservative Peter were overcome and Paul of Tarsus proclaimed the abrogation of the Mosaic Law. The 'apostle to the Gentiles' envisaged the Church of God as one and dual at the same time, in which Jew and Greek had each his place. He therefore left the prerogatives of Israel untouched; the ancient gifts of grace and the election were irrevocable. The inherent logic of the Pauline position, however, made for a dethronement of the Jewish people. The new Christian people claimed that the election was from the start for themselves. They appropriated the Old Testament as their own and no longer the Jews' possession. . . . With these pretensions the Church . . . captured a humanity wearied of the hollowness of Paganism by a residue of Jewish truth stripped of Jewish ceremonies and national limitations' (pp. 228, 229).

The authors give an interesting account of Manasseh Ben-Israel and of his conversations with Cromwell concerning the 're-admission' of the Jews to England. Fortunately there was no official act in favour of the Jews: such an act would undoubtedly have been accompanied by special legislation which would have placed them at a disadvantage as compared with their fellow-citizens (page 493).

One may regret that the scale of the book does not allow a fuller treatment of the opinions of Spinoza. 'The Unity of God was for him so conclusive that it left no room for the universe outside Him. Whether we say God or Nature makes no difference. . . . God is the one Substance, two of whose attributes are Extension and Thought' (page 500).

Time again fails the authors to deal adequately with such writers and thinkers as Moses Mendelsohn (1727–1786) the translator of the Pentateuch into pure German (not Yiddish), N. H. Wessely his associate in the writing of the accompanying commentary, Leopold Zunz (1794–1886) 'the creator of the history of Jewish literature', S. D. Luzzatto of Padua (1800–1865), grammarian and commentator on Isaiah. An unfavourable judgement is passed on Jost for his 'shallow rationalism and cold detachment'. On the other hand N. Krochmal (1785–1840) is praised. His work on Jewish history 'signified a strengthening of the Jewish consciousness and a reinterpretation of the essence of Judaism, in which unreasoned enthusiasm and cold logic are reconciled to form a "faith refined".' S. J. L. Rapoport (1790–1868) also receives his meed of praise.

The last chapter is concerned with the Palestinian mandate. The authors are pleased with present conditions. The Palestinian Jew is 'free politically, free to speak his own language, free to bring up his children in Jewish schools'. . . . 'Blessed be He who hath kept us alive to reach this day' (page 737)!

A bibliography of fourteen pages is attached to the work, and parallel chronological tables giving dates of contemporaneous events in Portugal-Spain, England, Italy, Holland, Germany, Turkey, Poland, and Palestine. There are fifteen maps, ancient and modern, ranging from 'Egypt and the Semitic World about 1400 B.C.' to 'Europe in 1926'. Among them is a map of England under Edward I, the presence of which is explained by the unhappy fact that the first general expulsion to befall the Jews was from England in 1290.

Looking back over the pages of this volume, though we are tantalized by the brevity with which great subjects are treated, we cannot withhold our admiration from the successful labour bestowed on the writing of it. The general story could hardly be told better within the narrow limits assigned. Perhaps a little too much is said (for the twentieth century) of Christian persecutions of Jews. One would have preferred to hear more of the best thought of Judaism and less of Gentile pogrom. But the Jews may retort, So it came to pass.

W. Emery Barnes.

The Book of Numbers (Westminster Commentaries), by the Rev. L. Elliott Binns, D.D., F.R.Hist.S. (Methuen, 1927.)

The authors of the Westminster Commentaries have not an entirely free hand in the treatment of their subject, in that the scope of the series is closely defined in the prefatory statement by the General Editor: 'it is to be less elementary than the Cambridge Bible for Schools, less critical than the International Critical Commentary, and less didactic than the Expositor's Bible'. There is, however, ample room for Commentaries corresponding with that description; and it may be said at once that, working within the range permitted him, Mr Binns has produced an excellent volume in the series. The editions of *Numbers* by Dr McNeile in the Cambridge Bible Series (R.V. 1911), and Dr A. R. S. Kennedy in the Century Bible, will remain valuable; but Mr Binns's work is alike more ample and more satisfying. The more important question is the comparison with the late Dr Buchanan Gray's volume in the International Critical Commentaries. To follow the work of so learned and distinguished a scholar as Dr Gray is no easy task. Nevertheless, on the test of a number of notable passages, it will be felt that Mr Binns has so clearly stated the essential point at issue, or summarized what is debateable, that his book gives the impression of being less burdened than the I. C. C., and only a little less thorough in its treatment. For careful discussion of the Hebrew text—a matter to which further attention requires to be given, since it is after all an essential basis for criticism—Dr Gray's book will still be indispensable. Otherwise it is Mr Binns's edition which one would now commend to students as preferable. The Introduction is particularly good, and a distinct improvement on the I. C. C.—compare, for example, Mr Binns's pages on the Historical Value of *Numbers*, and (still more) those on its Religious Value.

It is twenty years, and more, since the appearance of Dr Gray's volume (1903), and the standard German editions by Baentzsch (1903) and Holzinger (1903), so that there are many features in the elucidation of the Book of Numbers that require renewed discussion (e.g. the Hittites, p. 89). Pentateuchal criticism does not seem at present to be in the way of becoming simpler; but if Mr Binns has not anything very new to offer us towards unravelling the threads of the continued debate, and may be said to occupy the now usual 'critical' position, he is probably very sensible in adhering to that general view. And it is much to his credit that he seems to have taken cognizance of all recent matter of importance in this field, both 'advanced' (e.g. Hölscher, Eissfeldt) and 'conservative' or 'semi-conservative' (Wiener, Sellin, etc.). Instead of the normal references to (say) Wellhausen or Driver, he quotes interestingly and with telling effect from recent *Conservative* writers, to shew how inevitable is some critical analysis and recognition of the intricate literary and historical problems raised by the Book. While he disagrees with the general arguments advanced by such writers, he seeks to deal with their work fairly—pointing out instances where they have raised real, even if minor, difficulties against the normal critical opinion.

Numbers is so severely legal a portion of scripture that it is a feat on Mr Binns's part to have produced so readable a Commentary. He has achieved it partly by a clear and vigorous style, which reflects his mastery of the topic both as a whole and in its often complex details; partly by the wide range of his reading. Without encumbering the book he has packed much erudite and apposite quotation into its pages, and his allusions to modern writers on Semitic custom and travels, to Greek and Latin authors, and (an unusual and welcome source) to medieval historians are admirable. The parallels he adduces from the customs, laws, and ideas of the Middle Ages are outstandingly interesting and helpful in illustration.

Some points of criticism may be made. One remark in the Introduction (p. xlii) seems curiously out of keeping with the general tone of the volume. There Mr Binns remarks: 'Many of the narratives of the Old Testament, and even some of its laws, if they are to mediate to us real spiritual lessons, require a mystical, and not a literal interpretation.' He quotes Augustine in support of this view, but Calvin (in a foot-note) to the contrary, thus 'It is better to confess ignorance than to play with frivolous guesses'—i. e. regarding the mystical significance of the Levitical Law. Surely our sympathies here should be with Calvin? The time is long past when we need seek spiritual nourishment by assigning *mystical* meanings to passages in the O.T.; and it is precisely through the immensely greater knowledge of their literal meaning, which modern research has made possible, that we can appreciate more fully than ever before the real religious values of Old Testament narratives and laws.

On p. 93 in the note on *The Glory of the Lord* reference should be made to the late Dr Abraham's book, *The Glory of God* (1925).

On p. 217 n. reference should certainly be made to Dr S. A. Cook's remarks, on the Date of the Exodus, in the Cambridge Ancient History II. Finally, it would seem as if Mr Binns must have overlooked Sir G. A. Smith's Schweich Lectures (1910) on the Early Poetry of Israel; and, good though his notes are on the archaic poetical fragments in Numbers (x 35; xxi 17; xxi 14, 15 and 27–30; and especially the Balaam oracles, xxiii, xxiv), nevertheless they would have gained in interest and breadth of treatment from a study of G. A. Smith's discussion.

These are but questions of detail. Mr Binns has furnished us with an up-to-date and spirited Commentary, which should certainly be received as a valuable addition to the literature on the Old Testament.

W. A. L. ELMSLIE.

A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew, by M. H. SEGAL, M.A. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1927.)

MANY years have passed since Mr Segal published in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* an introductory sketch of the grammar of the Mishna, and since then all English scholars have been hoping that he would elaborate his theme. For although Albrecht's *Neuhebräische Grammatik auf Grund der Mišna* (1913) is excellent, it is very short, and has not been translated into English. Mr Segal's book is full, not to say elaborate, and is very welcome indeed.

He tells us that he has a double purpose: first and chiefly, 'to provide students of early Rabbinic literature with a fairly complete grammar of the dialect of that literature', and, secondly, 'to demonstrate the organic connexion of this Mishnaic dialect with Biblical Hebrew, and its relative independence of contemporary Aramaic, at least in the field of grammar'. For he makes much of this, and it is a matter of considerable importance. It will be remembered, for example, that when Delitzsch desired to reproduce the sayings of our Lord in their original language he chose for his translation of the New Testament not Aramaic in any of its forms, but the Hebrew of the Mishna. He considered (wrongly indeed, as is generally held to-day) that our Lord and His contemporaries spoke Mishnaic Hebrew. Mr Segal does not seem to go quite so far as that, but he does think Hebrew continued as a living language much later than is generally supposed. He says: 'The home of MH [Mishnaic Hebrew] was Palestine. So long as the Jewish people retained some sort of national existence in Palestine, MH continued to be the language of at least a section of the Jewish people living in Palestine. As Jewish life in Palestine gradually decayed, and eventually suffered total extinction, so MH was banished step by step from everyday life, and eventually, towards the end of the Mišnaic period, became confined to the learned in the schools and academies. With the ruin of these schools in Palestine, MH disappeared altogether from its native home, but continued to exist side by side with Aram. in the Jewish academies of Babylon, whither it had been carried by the Palestinian immigrants. When, in their turn, the Babylonian academies also decayed, towards the end of the Talmudic period, the last remnant of MH died out. The dialect continued a more or less fitful and precarious existence as a literary medium, until it passed into the new literary dialect of Medieval Hebrew' (§ 13).

He does not deny that 'during our period Aramaic was understood and used in Palestine' (§ 22), but MH 'still remained a popular speech, as is testified by many passages in its literature. Thus, e.g., the Jewish damsels at their dances in the vineyards sing to the young men in MH (Ta'a. iv 8); the taunt-song against the tyranny of the powerful priests is in MH (P^{e}s. 57 a: t.M^{e}n. xiii 21); popular vows are in MH (N^{e}d. i 1, &c.)' (§ 20). Mr Segal adds indeed in a note, 'cf. בנדרים הלך אחר לשון בני אדם, N^{e}d. 30 b. 51 b and Rashi, *ad loc.*', but this surely means: 'in vows one uses common parlance', without any reference to the language as such, e. g. Hebrew or Aramaic. Among the more noticeable sections in which he adduces further evidence on this point §§ 89, 385, 390 may be mentioned.

But Mr Segal is not primarily concerned with theories (however important), but with facts. And he here states with extreme particularity the facts of both the Grammar and the Syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew. He is careful, it may be noted, to use the term 'Mishnaic' and not 'New Hebrew'. For non-Biblical Hebrew is of three kinds, the two later growing out of the first but far from identical with it; viz. Mishnaic (from about 400 B.C. to about A.D. 400), Medieval Hebrew (from the redaction of the Babylonian Talmud about A.D. 500 to 1700), and Modern Hebrew (from about 1700 to the present time). The term Mishnaic prevents confusion.

After a general Introduction (§§ 1–28) in which he deals with the subjects mentioned above and others cognate to them, Mr Segal turns to Part I, Phonology and Orthography (§§ 29–66), giving the evidence for the pronunciation, and then dealing in detail with the vowels and the consonants. Part II is Morphology (§§ 67–305), dealing with Pronoun, Verb (both generally and in detail), Noun, and Particles. Throughout he compares MH with Biblical Hebrew, showing modifications, losses, and additions. He is then free for Part III, the Syntax (§§ 306–517) of Verb, Noun, Pronoun, and Sentences and Clauses. The table of Contents is so very full and detailed that an Index is made unnecessary. A list, however, of the Biblical passages to which reference is made is appended.

We have nothing but praise for Mr Segal's work, and congratulate him upon it. A curious slip, however, occurs in one passage (§ 491), where the translation of

אִלְמָלֵא חִטִּיחַ בֶּן זַכַּאי אֶת רֹאשׁוֹ . . . לֹא הָיוּ מַשְׁגִּחִין בּוֹ

is given as 'if the son of Zakkai had shot his head . . . they would have taken no notice of him'. The meaning is, If the son of Zakkai (the speaker) had pressed his head down between his knees in prayer God would have taken no notice of him, whereas the prayer of a fellow Rabbi was heard at once.

The printing seems to be immaculate (save one word in § 335), an extraordinary achievement in view of the number of the Hebrew words, nearly all of which are fully pointed.

Masoreten des Westens, von PAUL KAHLE. Mit Beiträgen von Dr ISRAEL RABIN und 30 Lichtdrucktafeln. (W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1927).

THREE, not two, systems of pointing the Hebrew Bible, the earliest of them, the Palestinian, being very imperfect yet affording the nucleus out of which grew both the Babylonian or supralineal and the common or Tiberian systems; the necessity for this last method of pointing if the wishes of the Qaraites were to be satisfied, or their theories refuted, and, again, if the challenge of the Qoran was to be met, with its claim to a text certain in every detail and completely immaculate; the lateness of the present received text based on rather poor MSS of the fifteenth century; the vindication of the early date (A.D. 856) ascribed to the Cambridge Codex and accepted by Schiller-Szinessy (No. 12 in his Catalogue); the restoration of Firkowitsch' huge collections of early MSS to general trustworthiness, in spite of his alteration of dates to make them appear earlier than they are—these are some of the conclusions set forth with due evidence by Dr Kahle. This new volume of his is therefore very welcome, as a complement to his earlier work on *Masoreten des Ostens* (1913), and his summary of the results which he had reached in 1922, when he contributed pp. 71–156 to Bauer and Leander's thought-provoking *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des alten Testaments.*

This new volume gives, as has been hinted above, the outcome of Dr Kahle's fuller investigations. He tells us that these were ultimately due to a few photographs sent by Dr Cowley of pages of a strangely pointed Hebrew MS in the Bodleian. These proved to be Pijutim for the 9th of Ab, punctuated according to a system hardly known before, but now recognized as 'Palestinian'. He is able to give us photographs of all the pages that exist.

The plan of the work is this. He deals first with the received Masoretic text, and its relation to Ben Asher's. But who is Ben Asher, he asks. And the answer is that while it is the name of a family of many generations of Masoretes in Tiberias, it refers especially to the last member of the family, Aaron ben Moses ben Asher, and his father Moses ben Asher. Moses ben Asher wrote and pointed in A.D. 895 the codex of the Prophets which is now in the Qaraite synagogue in Cairo; Aaron, the MS of the whole Bible with points and Masora now in the Sephardic synagogue at Aleppo. Whether Aaron ben Moses ben Asher really wrote this has been greatly disputed, but after a long investigation Kahle thinks that we have no right to deprive him of the honour. It is the same with the earlier MS now in Cairo. The objection to both MSS is, in particular, that they often do not agree with the received Masoretic text. But this objection does not lie against them alone, but against all the older MSS. The fact is that the developement of Masoretic studies did not cease with the Ben Ashers. Their methods and learning were accepted, but developement in both methods and learning took place after their time.

Kahle's second chapter describes the beginnings of pointing in the

West. Neubauer's little article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for April 1895, pp. 361–364, on a strange form of Hebrew 'shorthand' with words abbreviated and accompanied by a new kind of vocalization, was the first to call attention to the subject. But no one has worked it out as fully as Dr Kahle. It is closely connected with the Samaritan system. He then (ch. iii) gives some account of the Masoretes of Tiberias and their work, shewing that at first they were satisfied with adding here and there a vowel to make the Palestinian system clearer, but afterwards were obliged to go through everything afresh, adding, perhaps concurrently, accents as well as vowels. Hence our modern 'Hebrew Grammar' consists for the most part in rediscovering the rules by which the Masoretes affixed their different signs. How far these agreed with the original pronunciation of Hebrew in Biblical times is another question. Dr Kahle thinks that in the solution of this Wutz' book (not yet completed, but reviving Tychsen's theory that the LXX was translated from a Hebrew text transliterated into Greek) will play an important part.

In the fourth chapter Kahle describes the old Hebrew MSS in Leningrad, and it is satisfactory to learn not only that they are being properly cared for, but also that it is possible for a foreigner to consult them there without being harassed, and indeed with the power of securing valuable assistance. They are the two large collections by Firkowitzsch, whose falsifications Kahle assures us are easily detected. He describes fourteen MSS, and gives us photographs of specimen pages. One was written in A. D. 930 by the writer of the Aleppo MS mentioned above, and the others are of various dates down to A. D. 1121. They seem to have been entirely neglected by recent editors of the Masoretic text.

The last chapter describes the Liturgical texts mentioned above, together with some others. This is followed by an Appendix containing a transliteration of these into ordinary Hebrew type, with a translation and notes. To sum up; Dr Kahle has written an exceedingly valuable treatise likely to influence profoundly the course of Masoretic studies, and to lead to a fresh consideration of the minutiae of the received text.

Studies of the Spanish Mystics, by E. ALLISON PEERS, M.A. Vol. I. (The Sheldon Press, 1927.)

ENTRE los pucheros anda el Señor. So said S. Teresa, or, in English paraphrase, 'Among the pots and pans walketh the Lord.' But this is the utterance of all spiritual religion, not of Mysticism in the technical sense. Nor again is Francisco de Osuna's 'All created things are a ladder whereby the feet of the wise ascend to God' (p. 88). Mysticism proper professes far more than this. It is occupied with the state of the soul, and, though the Mystics would be the first to welcome McCheyne's dictum, 'For one look at self, take ten looks at Christ,' they seem to us sober Englishmen to be far too much given to introspection. The Mystic, in the meaning given to the word in this volume, is 'one who has fallen in love with God' (p. xiii), and walks in the threefold Way, the Purgative, the Illuminative, and the Unitive. In the first he recognizes his sinfulness and endeavours to overcome it. In the second he meditates on God, contemplating Him, while God Himself feeds and refreshes him (p. 249). In the third, 'the soul, like a second Jacob, ascends to Bethel, which being interpreted is the House of God, for there God receives the soul as into His own House. . . . God taketh possession of him, for this is that which comes to pass when the human spirit takes refuge in God, and is united with Him that can do all things' (pp. 117 sq.). Or, as S. Teresa says, 'all the faculties fail here, and are suspended in such a manner that their working can in no wise be comprehended. . . . The will must be fully occupied in loving, but it understands not that it loves; the understanding, if it comprehends, understands not how it comprehends, or, at the least, the object of its comprehension. I think myself that it works not at all' (p. 161).

Mr Peers has set himself a great task, that of making the Mystics of Spain known to us in England. For until now that knowledge has been confined to few, and in itself has been very slight and partial. For few know more than a little of S. Teresa, and perhaps of Luis de Granada and S. John of the Cross, besides, of course, S. Ignatius of Loyola, who indeed comes first in this volume, though his mysticism is of a curious kind.

Mr Peers tells us of the difficulties encountered in planning his project. The first was that of the classification and arrangement of at least forty to fifty authors. He adopted a combination of the order of merit and of chronology. The second lay in the extreme rarity of the books, and of the manuscripts, of most of the writers, which is still involving long and arduous search in monasteries and private houses scattered throughout Spain. But with the seven greater mystics contained in this volume the latter difficulty was, as it seems, not felt so much. These are S. Ignatius, Luis de Granada, Francisco de Osuna, S. Teresa, S. John of the Cross, Luis de León, and Juan de los Ángeles, all, it will be observed, belonging to the sixteenth century. The method employed is first to give a short account of the writer, and then a somewhat full summary of his mystical teaching, together with extracts. In this way the reader obtains a first-hand acquaintance with at least the leading points on which each insists.

But Mr Peers has done more than this. He has added Bibliographies which form perhaps the most valuable part of the whole volume. I. Selected works of a general character on Mysticism and related subjects which deal with the Spanish Mystics. II. Selected works dealing with Spanish History and Literature in which reference is made to the Spanish Mystics. III. Serviceable Bibliographies for Students of Spanish Mysticism. IV. Works on Spanish Mysticism. And V, more particularly, a copious and detailed Bibliography of the Authors studied in this volume: (1) Old Editions, (2) Recent Editions, (3) Translations, and (4) Commentaries. Henceforth the student of Mysticism in Spain will know where he can find information, and the devout Christian who desires to learn something of the higher stages of the Divine life will know which author, and which edition, will best suit his immediate purpose.

A. Lukyn Williams.

Mittelalterliches Geistesleben, by Martin Grabmann. (Hueber, Munich, 1926.)

Dr Grabmann's solid and almost formidable volume presents a remarkable picture of his ceaseless activity in the field of medieval learning to which he has devoted his life. His main object has been to impart the coherence of a book to a number of essays and studies hitherto scattered through periodicals, and likely, therefore, to escape the notice of many inquirers. It has not, however, been purely a case of reprinting old matter. In one or two instances the original was published in a foreign language, and is now translated into German. The important discussion of the Aristotelian Commentaries of St Thomas has been fully revised; while at the beginning of the volume there is an entirely new survey of the aims and methods of research in scholastic and mystical literature, supplemented by an interesting account of the Franciscan School at Quaracchi, to which we owe, among other things, the monumental edition of St Bonaventura's works. To one about to embark upon the medieval ocean Dr Grabmann's masterly description of the manifold routes and harbours may sound not unlike Dante's warning in the *Paradiso*, Canto ii:—

O voi che siete in piccioletta barca,
  Desiderosi d' ascoltar, seguiti
  Retro al mio legno che cantando varca,
Tornate a riveder li vostri liti.

Dr Grabmann, to be sure, does not sing as he goes his way, but his indication of the vast expanse of modern erudition, together with his statement (quoted from Cardinal Ehrle) that not more than a fourth or fifth part of extant scholastic theology and philosophy has yet been printed, does provoke some rather serious doubts about the policy of the future. How much of the unprinted is really worth printing? No answer, of course, is possible until the contents of all the libraries have been inspected. But is there not some ground, after the old contempt for medievalism, for fearing a reaction towards an uncritical enthusiasm for every work composed between certain dates? Some excuse for scepticism is even supplied, though accidentally, by Dr Grabmann himself. He gives us, for example, a learned discourse on the medieval *Sprachlogik*, and reviews the array of MSS still existing to illustrate its history. But when he arrives at the question of *Bedeutung*, there is, surely, very little to be said. To understand in a general way the ancient connexion of language and logic, embedded in terms such as *vox* and *sermo*, is certainly important; but what else can we say in the end of that kind of logic but that it was crude and childish, an unfortunate legacy from which the medieval philosophers had to extricate themselves as best they could? The less these forgotten text-books are reprinted, the better for all concerned.

On the other hand, no such criticism is applicable to the bulk of Dr Grabmann's essays, least of all to those which treat directly of St Thomas, or of persons and matters related to the central movement of medieval philosophy. Ulrich of Strassburg, for example, a pupil of the great Albert, seems well to deserve attention, and the same is true of John of Kastl, whose authorship of the *De adhaerendo Deo*, so long ascribed to Albert, has been conclusively proved by Dr Grabmann. Another interesting discovery of Dr Grabmann's is the Aristotelian commentaries of Siger of Brabant, which promise to throw some new light upon that unfortunate man. The study of commentaries—books about books about books—never sounds very inspiring, but Dr Grabmann's handling of the subject, especially in relation to St Thomas and Aristotelianism, should easily convince us that dry bones may live. Perhaps the most important fact, now gradually emerging from this line of research, is the distinction, not only in methods of study, but also in wider questions of policy, between the two University faculties of Theology and Arts. The typical commentary of the 'artist' grows out of the educational course, assumes the style of a lecture, and tends to pass into the form of the *quaestio disputata*, in which the text of Aristotle may serve chiefly as a peg for the lecturer's opinions. The tradition of the theologians is different, and the commentaries of St Thomas are literary works, not indeed excluding important digressions, but primarily directed to the exposition of Aristotle's text. Moreover, the artists were frankly occupied with 'profane' studies, and it was no immediate concern of theirs to prove that Aristotelian doctrines were either consonant or dissonant with Catholic theology. Human nature being much the same then as now, they probably enjoyed having a dig at the theologians, and thus it easily becomes intelligible that Siger of Brabant and others should exploit the Averroist interpretation and accompany it with the cynical doctrine of the twofold truth. For St Thomas it was a very different problem. Gifted with deeper insight into the intellectual crisis of Europe, and with keener understanding of the political situation, he had to combine the apparently discrepant aims, first, of expounding Aristotle honestly, with the least possible reference to current disputes; secondly, of proving that Aristotle, considered within his proper limitations, could be freely studied without detriment to the Church. The phases in his own developement, as an expositor of Aristotle, are revealed to close inspection, and some important passages relevant to this question are cited by Dr Grabmann. It was, for example, only by degrees that he came to see that Aristotle's argument for the eternity of motion was no mere dialectical exercise, but a definite judgement. Yet when he did see it, he admitted it without hesitation, and even dismissed as 'frivolous' the attempt to prove that Aristotle had said nothing contrary to the faith. Or again, it has now become clear that the gradual stiffening of the opposition to Averroes was not due to theological animus, but rather to a better knowledge of Aristotle, derived from translations made directly from the Greek, or from commentators belonging to the Greek tradition. *Nec video quid pertineat ad doctrinam fidei qualiter philosophi verba exponantur.* So writes St Thomas to the General of his Order, and side by side with this saying we may set his weighty comment on diversities of interpretation:—*quicquid autem horum sit non est nobis curandum, quia studium philosophiae non est ad hoc quod sciatur quid homines senserint, sed qualiter se habeat veritas rerum.* The man whose eventual position was expressed in these aphorisms can scarcely be dismissed as the slave of authority or as the garbler of ancient authors in the interest of dogmatic preconceptions.

Other valuable essays, deserving more consideration than can here be allowed them, are those relating to the conception of natural right, to the women mystics of Germany, and to the metaphysical disputations of Suarez. Whatever his subject, we find in Dr Grabmann the same first-hand knowledge, the same lucidity, the same complete grasp of the principles which should govern the various kinds of research into the spiritual life of the medieval world.

W. H. V. READE.

Preaching in Medieval England: An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the period c. 1350–1450, by G. R. OWST, M.A., Ph.D., Assistant Editorial Secretary to the Medieval-Latin Dictionary Committee. (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1926. *Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought*, edited by G. G. Coulton.)

HITHERTO medieval preaching has received comparatively little study. There was a time when it was almost a point of honour with Protestants to believe that all medieval clergymen were 'dumb hounds'; and even as recently as 1921 Father Bede Jarrett expressed the opinion that in medieval England strictly formal preaching had little or no place. In this matter as in others Cardinal Gasquet has deserved our gratitude, if not for the inerrancy of his conclusions, at least for breaking through erroneous traditions. Dr Owst has given four years of work not only to the printed sermons of the period 1350–1450 but also to a mass of manuscripts scattered in University, College, and Cathedral libraries, most of which it is safe to say have not been read for many centuries. His conclusions have therefore a weight which no other writing on medieval sermons can have. From many points of view this is not merely the best, it is the only book on the subject. Dr Owst has indeed produced that extremely rare thing: a new book, new not so much because he corrects his predecessors as because he has had in many places no predecessors.

The book falls into three parts: the preachers, the preaching, and the preached word. In the first we trace the personal record of two preaching bishops, Fitzralph and Brunton, and there follows an estimate of the quantity and quality of the preaching of the beneficed clergy. Next come studies of the monastic and the mendicant preachers, the pardoners, the hermits, and the Lollards. The second section (perhaps the least original) discusses the times and places of sermons and the reception that they had from the congregations, whether as part of the regular service *inter missarum sollemnia* or on more special occasions at crosses and in procession. In the third part we reach the sermon manuscripts themselves, Latin and English, and that mass of tracts and verse whose close relationship with the medieval sermon Dr Owst has most happily elucidated. He has much to say about the northern school of translators (of whom Rolle may be taken both as inspirer and as symbol); but though he convinces us of its importance he does not entirely succeed in shewing precisely what its importance is. Dr Owst's work is of the greatest value in providing a true setting for one side of the activities of Wyclif and his followers; the Lollard movement appears not as a revolt against the general current of the times, but as the extreme left wing of contemporary thought with many parallels among the orthodox, distinguishable from the orthodox indeed only with the greatest difficulty. In the last part of the book Dr Owst takes us into the study of the medieval preacher and shews us how he composes his sermon.

Though the production of the book is characteristic of the press from which it comes there are a few misprints. Dr Owst is over-fond of commas, but we think he would delete one from p. 96 and one from p. 353. The Latin of pages 141 and 212 is suspect. A capital *a* has been dropped from p. 344, and on pp. 346–347 there is wavering between *H* and *h* in references to our Lord. It is an unfortunate oversight which leads Dr Owst to deprive Cardinal Gasquet of any honorific prefix in many passages in text and notes, though he is punctilious about e.g. M. Jusserand. On p. 334, note 5, there is no proper reference to an earlier foot-note.

Dr Owst is an enthusiast and he has some of the enthusiast's defects. He reproves some of the scholars who cross his path with unnecessary crudeness. He sometimes exaggerates, as when (in the course of a most enlightening discussion of *Piers Plowman* as 'the quintessence of English Mediaeval preaching gathered up into a single metrical piece of unusual charm and vivacity') he refers to the literature of the pulpit as 'the one complete clue' to the poem. Certain rather cheap sneers at Moody and Sankey and at Protestant preaching in general seem to us unworthy of so scholarly a book, and before Dr Owst dismisses eighteenth-century meeting-houses as unbeautiful and unadorned he should study more carefully such as remain. We hope that Dr Owst in future will forget the existence of the exclamation mark, will purge his writing of hackneyed expressions, and will write with more simplicity and restraint.

But it would be ungrateful and misleading to end with a note of criticism. It is a pleasing necessity to emphasize again the extraordinary interest and the sound scholarship of Dr Owst's work. By one book he has placed himself in an assured position among medieval scholars. His learning, his patience, and his affectionate appreciation of his material are beyond any question. We look forward to his more detailed discussion of the contents of the sermon manuscripts to which this book has introduced us.

The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort, by A. W. Harrison, M.C., B.Sc., D.D., Vice-Principal of Westminster Training College. (University of London Press, Ltd., London, 1926.)

Lovers of 'the ever-memorable Mr John Hales' are familiar with what will probably always remain the most attractive English introduction to the Synod of Dort, but Hales's letters need a supplement and it has not been easy to find one for the English reader. Superciliousness about Calvinistic theology and theologians rather than understanding of them has marked much English writing in recent years. To-day there are not a few signs of a change to a more intelligent and sympathetic appreciation of Calvin and his work, and as one of these signs Dr Harrison's book is very welcome. Though his title is Arminianism, of necessity much of his theme is Calvinism.

About a third of the book treats of Arminius himself and does full justice to his scholarship, his piety, and his charm. The second section covers the ten years between his death and the execution of Barnevelt in 1619. The last two chapters tell in some detail the story of the Synod and most usefully set out in full the Synod's conclusions concerning the Five Points of the Remonstrance. Dr Harrison's method throughout is purely historical; there is little attempt to give the theological background of the Remonstrant movement, to find its springs in any theological tradition, or to estimate its influence in later history. An interesting glimpse of the relationship between Arminian and Socinian views of the Atonement is given, but it is a glimpse only. As a narrator Dr Harrison excels. He enters with sympathy into the motives of Arminian and Calvinist, and though his heroes are Arminius and Wtenbogaert, perhaps the chief effect of his work is to shew that the High Calvinist opposition to Arminianism was not based on mere theological obscurantism; it rested even more on a determination to maintain the freedom of the Church from state control. Dr Harrison is at his best in unravelling the threads of political and theological influences; no one can read his book without revising unfavourable opinions of Dutch Calvinism formed by the brilliant perversity and transparent bias of Motley.

Not the least interesting part of the book is that which makes clear the interest taken in the struggle by James I and his influence in helping the orthodox to victory. In theology James was the ally of the High Calvinists whose anti-Erastianism he was fighting in English Puritanism. His interventions reveal that Stuart muddleheadedness which made him for all his ability so futile a figure in Europe and which condemned his country and his church to a trivial part in an age of great issues. The parallel between the ecclesiastical and political struggles in England and the Netherlands in the seventeenth century has often been drawn; Dr Harrison has good things to say of it, but we do not think that the story, at least as he tells it, justifies his judgement that the persecution after the Synod of Dort of the Arminian Dissenters was 'even more virulent' than the policy named from the Clarendon Code. Dr Harrison does his best for the attractive Grotius, but when all is said Grotius's moral courage fell below the level of his intellect; and in crises he revealed a strain of weakness and something approaching selfish apathy about his friends.

The book is attractively produced with but few misprints. On p. 208 the word *Presbyterians* is difficult to understand. On p. 309 (last line but one) *November* seems to be a mistake for *December*. On pp. 34, 61, 355, and 387 letters are misplaced or inverted. Dr Harrison wavers a little in the spelling of names, as on pp. 94 and 95, where he gives no less than three ways of spelling van Aerssen, and then on p. 277 adds a fourth. It is most regrettable that, apparently in a needless attempt to brighten what is a very good style of writing, Dr Harrison frequently descends to colloquial and cant expressions and cheap humour sometimes in questionable taste.

Macaulay once lamented that whilst every schoolboy knew something of the Spanish empire in America 'English gentlemen of highly cultivated minds' knew little or nothing of matters in India that concerned them more nearly. The same lament might be made about ecclesiastical studies. Most of us know more of North Africa or Assisi than of Heidelberg or Dort. Dr Harrison has removed many of our excuses, and has shewn that even behind supralapsarianism and sublapsarianism are living issues and human endeavour.

Christianity and the French Revolution, by A. AULARD. Translated by LADY FRAZER. (*The Library of European Political Thought*, edited by HAROLD J. LASKI, M.A. London, Ernest Benn, Ltd., 1927.)

'THE story of this attempt to destroy the Christian life . . .,' says the publishers' note, 'is of particular interest in the light of the situation in Russia to-day.' It is difficult indeed to avoid marking parallels between France and Russia as we watch the early attempts to secure a new reformed 'constitutional' church followed by attempts to extirpate religion: first by the toleration and encouragement of the rivals of the dominant confession, then by the application of force and terror, and then by the less dramatic methods of 'education' and 'cultural atmosphere'.

Despite the title of the series in which it appears, this book is a study rather of political action than of political thought. M. Aulard has collected the principal legislative and administrative acts which affected religion from 1789 to the Concordat of 1802, and has described the manner in which public opinion received them. With the ease and precision of the true scholar he illustrates from his exceptional knowledge of the Revolution the general course of events. On some subjects, e.g. the fortunes of the Protestants and Jews, and the balance of strength between the papal and the constitutional church, the reader finds information which is not readily found elsewhere. But the truth is that, though M. Aulard presents the outline of the story in a spirited way, he has neither the space nor the time to do much more than collect what most full histories of the Revolution tell about his subject. It was indeed impossible to do more in a handsomely produced volume of whose 164 numbered pages not less than 23 are either blank or almost blank.

'My endeavour', writes M. Aulard, 'has been to be impartial'. On this subject no reasonable person would expect perfect impartiality; especially in the early part of his book M. Aulard has succeeded better than his earlier writings led us to expect. M. Aulard knows too much to minimize the sufferings of the faithful or to represent the administration of most government policy in this period as other than utterly tyrannical. He makes clear that there was little disposition at any time towards genuine toleration, and that from the beginning the Left strenuously opposed attempts to secure liberty of worship for all confessions. M. Aulard's sympathetic and understanding treatment of the somewhat ludicrous festivities of the Worship of Reason and of the Supreme Being is as laudable as it is unusual, but it stands in notable contrast with his failure to recognize in any generous or worthy way the faith of those who carried on Christian worship at the height of the atheistic Terror. Sometimes they had no priest (whose motives might be suspect) to help them, but M. Aulard thinks that 'wedded to their habits' is an adequate description of the state of mind of these countrymen of his. M. Aulard finds room even in this small book to repeat not once or twice what is surely either a very innocent or a slightly disingenuous wonder that, with the bloody examples of repression before their eyes, handfuls of unarmed, disorganized peasants did not attempt more often to prevent the desecration of parish churches by persons who could count on the resources of a military government. Time after time M. Aulard calls this 'indifference': we suggest the word 'fear'. M. Aulard is 'startled' to find that the effective government of the Terror did not provoke the same opposition as the feeble government of Louis XVI on the eve of its dissolution. He frankly says that the influence of the peasants was 'hardly felt' in the National Convention, yet allows himself with some naïvete to write of 'the people', when 'the Paris mob' would be probably quite as accurate a description of the men he has in mind.

M. Aulard has been most fortunate in his translator: except in a very few places we forget that it is a translation. The book is attractively produced, but much more care in co-ordinating the two calendars was needed in order to make the sequence of events at all clear to readers who have made no special study of the Revolution. For such a table of principal events would have been useful. The headings of § 2 and § 3 of Chapter II do not correspond with the division of the text.

M. Aulard leaves us still asking for the book which will answer the fundamental questions about the Revolution and religion. We want to know more of the religious views of the members of the successive assemblies and governing cliques. We have no explanation of the amazing career of Grégoire. We want the developement of opinion in Paris and outside traced with far more detail and impartiality than any one has yet given to it.

B. L. MANNING.

On the Symbols of Abbreviations for -tur. Speculum ii (1927) pp. 52–65: *A Nest of Ancient Notae, ib.* pp. 160–176, by E. K. RAND. (Milford, 1927.)

PROFESSOR RAND is going to make of *Speculum* a nest of observations on palaeography, always illustrated by many facsimiles. The first paper shews that Lindsay, *Notae Latinae*, p. 377, cautious as he always is, was too bold in saying that the *-ur* sign like a 2 came into general use about 820, the sort of statement that one welcomes so heartily. Here good reason is shewn for putting back its introduction by some twenty years, and it is suggested that on its side the older apostrophe survived beyond the middle of the ninth century. The MS with the 2 symbol that interests him most is Tours MS 10, a copy of the Octateuch of much importance to the Vatican editors of the New Vulgate, and he is inclined to see in it a pre-Alcuin copy of an Irish MS that was already at Tours when Alcuin came.

The second paper widens our conception of the sources of abbreviations. We used to put them down to the lawyers, following Isidore's account of the *Notae Iuris*; Lindsay has found many *notae* in a grammar-book, a commentary on the Psalms, and letters of St Augustine; we have also classics, the Cicero P. Oxy. 1097 and marginalia of Virgil and Terence. Now in Tours 286, Augustine *de Musica*, Rand points to a copy made perhaps by two men who worked on the Vatican Livy in a style that prevailed at Tours before Alcuin's reform: these men had an uncial archetype full of ancient abbreviations which they often copied exactly and occasionally misunderstood. Rand makes a list and distinguishes many that Lindsay has not included in his great study and many that were unknown to the Irish School, whereas most of the Irish stock are absent. Hence he argues that the few symbols hitherto classed as Irish that the MS contains must have been derived by the Irish from the continent and not invented.

So we gain a new link in the chain of continuity from ancient to medieval times; we have *notae* in a work on music as well as previously known subjects; people at Tours knew and read such *notae* pretty well; so when they avoided their use it was on purpose, yet even an early ninth-century MS may, like this one, be full of them: and the Irish probably invented less than we give them credit (or discredit) for. Who but Rand or Lindsay could have got so much out of a MS?

E. H. MINNS.

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea: The Ecclesiastical History and The Martyrs of Palestine, translated with Introduction and Notes by H. J. LAWLOR, D.D., Litt.D., and J. E. L. OULTON, B.D. Volume i. Translation. (S.P.C.K. 1927.)

THIS is a well-printed volume, with the matter clearly arranged and divided into sections with appropriate headings and dates. The translation, as translation, is couched in particularly lucid and good English—no small achievement when dealing with so turgid a writer as Eusebius. As the second volume containing the Introduction and Notes has not yet appeared, criticism must be confined to the renderings in such passages as seem to call for comment. Dr E. Schwartz's text (Leipzig 1903–1909) has with a few exceptions been followed. One is inclined to wish that the exceptions had been more in number. For instance, in i. 2. 11 there is given a rendering of the interpolated text unhappily adopted by Schwartz, ὑπάρχοντα δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν: while the parallel and equally unjustifiable interpolations of ἰσοκλεῆ and of εἰκόνα are ignored. No doubt the original text was simply ὕπαρχον in the sense of 'lieutenant, second in command', as was pointed out by Professor Claude Jenkins in *J. T. S.* x, January 1909, p. 277. Again, in ii. 23. 7 some notification should have been made that the text is corrupt and 'Oblias' unintelligible. A reference to *J. T. S.* xv, October 1913, p. 138, would have been useful.

In iii. 39. 3, in the quotation from that clumsy writer Papias, the contrast between the alien [Jewish] commandments and those of Christ is not brought out, and the Greek articles are ignored. E. C. Selwyn's criticism (*The Oracles in the New Testament*, page 413) of Lightfoot's translation cannot be overlooked. Read 'not in those who recall the alien commandments but in those [who recall] those given by the Lord to the faith, which reach me from the Truth itself'. Papias then explains how he had collected the statements of the Elders as to the sayings of the Apostles in their time, and how he treasured what Aristion and John the Elder were still saying. And then he goes on: 'For I did not imagine that the texts out of the books would profit me so much as the comments from a living and surviving voice.' The last words are possibly reminiscent of 1 Peter i. 23, but should not be italicized as a citation. Again, iii. 39. 15: τάξει is best translated as a rhetorical term, as F. H. Colson shewed in *J. T. S.* xiv, October 1912, p. 62. Τάξις means a complete scheme rather than an arrangement or order—still less a chronological order. Papias apologizes for Mark, first for not having followed the usual plan of the earliest preachers of the Gospel, which was to shew that Jesus was the promised Messiah because He fulfilled the prophetic oracles; and secondly for not having given the sayings and doings of Christ in a complete scheme. His Gospel was not in the form of a systematic exposition of the Dominical Oracles; and it was defective so far as τάξις was concerned, yet accurate so far as it went.

In iv. 22. 3 the much-disputed διαδοχὴν ἐποιησάμην is translated, following Lightfoot (*Clem. Rom.* i. 154), 'I made a succession-list'. It is true that Hegesippus (like Eusebius himself) is fond of recording episcopal successions, but the Greek here is an awkward expression, and probably contains some corruption. In the next sentence ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ must mean 'on the basis of the same tradition', as Robson pointed out in *J. T. S.* xv, October 1913, p. 139. And in the following sentence 'Thebuthis ... began secretly to corrupt her from the seven sects among the people, to which he himself belonged' is nonsense. The Greek itself is corrupt.

In v. 1. 7 'confinements' is not a good translation of συγκλείσεις, as it rather suggests 'imprisonments'. It means 'proscriptions' from bath and market-place and friends' houses. Renan pictured the position correctly (*Marc Aurèle*, p. 305). 'If one of them happened to be seen, wild clamours arose; he was beaten, pulled about, struck with stones, and *forced to barricade himself in.*'

Ibid. 22. The references in Note 6 should be to John iv 14, vii. 38, Rev. xxi 6; and not to John xix 34.

We shall await with great interest the publication of the second volume.

T. Herbert Bindley.

Tractate Shabbath (*Mishnah*), translated with explanatory notes by W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. (S.P.C.K., 1927). *Mediæval Hebrew Minstrelsy*, by H. M. Loewe and Rosa L. Henriques.

Dr. Oesterley justly remarks in his Introduction that of the sixty-three tractates included in the Mishnah, *Shabbath* is second to none in importance. Both as a holy day and a day of rest the Sabbath has been one of the strongholds of orthodox Judaism: and this tractate is the exposition of the rules and customs which govern the observance of the day. As such it has an importance for students of the New Testament, for much of the controversy between Jesus and the Pharisaic party turns on just the matters with which *Shabbath* is concerned.

In the present work we are given an introduction of twenty-seven pages followed by a translation with notes, and an index of scripture references. Translation and notes are good, and the paraphrastic additions to the text—enclosed within square brackets—are as good as a second commentary. There are however occasional lapses as well as places where a rendering different from Dr Oesterley's seems preferable. These are noted below.

p. 23 l. 10 for 'spiral pin' read 'perfumed charm'.

p. 28 l. 14 for 'severs' read 'sews'.

p. 31 ll. 3 f for 'a small sieve or a large sieve' read 'a fine sieve or a coarse sieve'.

p. 42 second note: for δαββατισμός read σαββατισμός.

p. 47 l. 13 'with his other hand' is impossible in view of the rule in xii 3 which prohibits the use of the pen with either hand. The context shews that unusual methods of writing are contemplated, and we must understand, with Rashi and Bartenora, some way of writing other than the ordinary, probably 'with the hand inverted' or perhaps 'with the back of the hand'. On the same page for χάλχανθος read χάλκανθος: and, line 4 from foot, for 'blood' read 'water'.

p. 58 ll. 15 f should be translated: 'and one may make a partition of all kinds of vessels, whether full or empty, so that the fire does not spread'. This is clear from the dictum of R. Jose which follows.

p. 59 l. 9 for 'increment' read 'excrement'.

p. 66 l. 17 for Eliezer' read 'Eleazar'.

p. 73 l. 6 'One may not scratch oneself'. The rendering seems too general. In this paragraph and the preceding, toilet operations are under consideration, and it is better to take the verb מתגררין as a reference to something of the kind. Rashi explains it as the use of the strigil (אשטריילא = O.F. *estrille* = Lat. *strigilis*) and some such rendering as 'one may not make use of a strigil' is to be preferred. 'One may not walk on a clay soil'. This translation does not commend itself either. Whatever פילומה may mean, it is evidently something to which one goes down as the verb יורדין shews. The most probable explanation is that of the Gemara, Rashi, and Maimonides, that the word signifies a bathing-pool with a clay or mud bottom: and the rendering would be 'one may not go down into a mud bath'. On the same page ll. 7 f read 'one may not straighten . . . and one may not set'.

p. 74 second note read פַּרְפָּרוֹת.

p. 79 ll. 9 ff read 'one may cut up pumpkins . . . and carrion'.

If the reading of the Mishnah *Shabbath* leaves one with a sense that the Jewish Sabbath is an elaborate bondage and its law a complicated piece of hair-splitting, Mr. Loewe's collection of songs may serve to remind us that there is another side to the picture, and that within the fence of the law an experience was possible which could clothe itself adequately only in the forms of music and poetry. *Mediæval Hebrew Minstrelsy* is a collection of sixteen *Zemiroth* with their traditional music. The poems are given according to the Hebrew text of Dr Hirschfeld together with English verse renderings by Mr Loewe to fit the Hebrew tunes. Each song is provided with notes, mainly references to the O.T., the more useful since the authors delighted in frequent and often very recondite allusions to Scripture. In addition there are introductory essays and a valuable appendix of literary parallels to the *Zemiroth*. The music is simply and effectively arranged by Mrs Henriques: and Miss Hirschfeld has made charming decorations as headpieces to the poems.

Apart from poems whose authors cannot be identified the present collection ranges from the tenth century to the sixteenth and covers a great variety of moods. Some of the songs are plaintive, some jovial and rollicking. Some are of a contemplative and mystical turn: one can only be described as a little apocalypse. In all the note of devotion and loyalty to the ancestral Faith is strong and clear.

The work of translating, annotating and embellishing this anthology is admirably done throughout. Only one point calls for correction. In the prayer on pp. 25 f the verbs are frequently given with the ending of the 3rd person in -eth. This should surely be altered to -est. But this is a very small thing. 'At last we have a worthy edition of the *Zemiroth*' says the Chief Rabbi in his foreword to the book. This is high praise and the book fully justifies it.

T. W. MANSON.

FATHER PRAT'S *La Théologie de Saint Paul* was welcomed in this JOURNAL (vol. xi p. 131) on its first appearance in 1908. That it has established itself firmly for a wide circle of readers is shewn by the fact that there have been eleven editions of it in French. The full learning of the book and its generally conservative handling of critical questions will commend to English readers of similar sympathies the translation now published (*The Theology of Saint Paul*, by FERNAND PRAT, S.J., translated from the French by JOHN L. STODDARD. Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, vol. i, 1926, vol. ii, 1927.)

Jesus the Nazarene—Myth or History? (T. Fisher Unwin, 1926) is a translation by Mr F. Stephens of M. Maurice Goguel's book which was reviewed in this JOURNAL last year (vol. xxvi p. 433). The translation reads well and is welcome. An excellent survey of the history of the discussion in France is given by M. Goguel himself in a recent number of *The Harvard Theological Review* (April, 1926), revealing a situation in French Protestantism like that with which we are familiar as regards the difficulty of establishing a fruitful partnership between science and faith, on which—as M. Goguel says—the future of religion in large measure depends.

The Expositor's Year Book (Hodder & Stoughton, 1926), edited by Dr James Moffatt, with the assistance of other scholars, furnishes a very useful survey of the work done in most of the departments of theological study during the year 1925, and supplies trustworthy short accounts of a mass of books and articles. A second volume just issued does the same good service for the work of the year 1926.

The Church's Debt to Heretics, by RUFUS M. JONES, D.D., Litt.D., LL.D. (James Clarke & Co., 1925), is an attractive little book. There is in it no direct eulogy or whitewashing of the heretics, and indeed much less about the Church's debt to them than the title suggests. Here and there the student of theology will be conscious of the amateur's mind and hand. That Dr Jones does not know the kind of problem with which Christian theologians are trying to deal to-day is shewn by what he says on p. 94 of the differences between Arians and Athanasians. The issue he picks out as being one of interest to the fourth century only is one very much to be debated in the twentieth—though, of course, in a way related to the new knowledge of our own times. But he gives us a very live and breezy survey of the history of doctrine which serious students of Theology may read with enjoyment and advantage, and there are some fine pages in conclusion on the testimony of the new evolutionary views to the spiritual interpretation of the universe (though the compositor has made Dr Jones call them '*r*evolutionary').

The Uniats and their Rites, by STEPHEN GASELEE (Alcuin Club Publication, A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1925) gives interesting information, which will be new to many readers of this JOURNAL, as to the history and position of the Uniats in Italy and Sicily, and photographs of Syrian Melchite Clerics vested for Mass. Mr Gaselee directs special attention to the amount of freedom which Rome allows the Uniat Churches in the celebration of their own rites, and he suggests the possibility of a future when the Church of England, having recovered unity by incorporating Wesleyans and other Nonconformists on similar terms, might be ready to accept in relation to Rome the like status of a Uniat Church.

J. F. B-B.

CHRONICLE

OLD TESTAMENT AND RELATED LITERATURE.

THE literature that falls to be noticed here may be conveniently summarized under three headings: Old Testament criticism; geography and history; and comparative religion. The first place may properly be given to the Festschrift, *Vom Alten Testament*, in celebration of the seventieth birthday of the late Prof. Karl Marti, and edited by Prof. Karl Budde (Beiheft xli of the *ZATW.*; Giessen, 1925). It may be remembered that the Berne Professor was taken suddenly ill and was actually buried on this birthday. One of the most outstanding of Biblical scholars, he was personally one of the most popular; and an admirable photograph of "כָּמַרְתִּי", as he sometimes humorously described himself, adds to the pathetic interest of a collection of essays which testify to the high esteem in which he was held. Here are contributions by Bertholet (the correspondence between Hitzig and Ewald), Meinhold (Ezra the scribe), Buhl (the prelude to the book of Job), Nowack (Deuteronomy and Kings), and others. Some of the contributors have since departed: Baudissin (an essay on El-Bethel), Gressmann (the holy cock at Hieropolis, the spelling is deliberate), Paul Haupt (Isa. liii), Naville (the use of Aramaic). English contributions are, to Prof. Budde's regret, unintentionally few in number: besides Haupt, we have Torrey of New Haven (prophecies relating to Alexander the Great, viz. Habakkuk, Ezek. xxvi, Joel, Zech. ix, Isa. xiv, xxiii), and Theodore Robinson of Cardiff (Jesus and the 'blood of the covenant'). Among other articles, Beer writes on Ps. xxii as *ein jüdisches Passionsgemeinschaftslied.* Benzinger distinguishes J and E in Gen. xiv, and conjectures that in it Abraham was primarily a Shechemite figure. Eerdmans, observing that sabbath-keeping is associated with fire (Exod. xxxv 3, Num. xv 32), suggests that the law against breaking the sabbath goes back to the Kenites or 'smiths', for whom the kindling of fire and labour were synonymous, and to whom the seventh day, that of the gloomy Saturn, would be no day for the smithy. Haller points out that the national hatred between Edom and Israel-Judah is not pre-exilic; the denunciations of Edom form a literary unit, and he dates them to the Maccabaean period—unnecessarily late (see *Camb. Anc. Hist.* vi 183 sqq.). Hehn manages to combine שׁבע 'seven' with שׂבע 'satiety': seven is not a 'round' number, but a 'perfect' one. Hölscher writes on later Jewish nomenclature, at Elephantine, Nippur, &c., an interesting topic, though unfortunately he does not appear to know Gray's study in the *Wellhausen-Festschrift*, or Daiches on the Nippur data (London, 1910), or my own attempt to get something out of the names on Hebrew seals, pottery stamps, &c., in the *Proceedings* of the old Society for Biblical Archaeology, 1904, pp. 109 sqq., 164 sqq. Humbert writes freshly on Hos. ii, which he considers to be a unity. Hans Schmidt thinks the אוב was a bull-roarer, though he recognizes that it is quite unusual for a woman (like the Witch of Endor) to manipulate one. Enough has been said, perhaps, to indicate the many-sided interest of this offering to one who was a personal friend of so many biblical scholars.

Johannes Meinhold's *Einführung in das Alte Testament* (Giessen, 2nd ed., 1926) is a substantial work of 344 pages, which is of special value by reason of the attention paid to recent German literature. On p. 285 Torrey is known only from a monograph published in Germany in 1896. There are good introductory chapters on origins, canon, and text; and Meinhold's general plan has been to combine history and literature. Thus the work differs from the Introductions of Driver, Sellin, and others, and recalls the chronological arrangement of Harran Creelman (see *J. T. S.*, July 1917, p. 344); and though not so full as the American book, it has the same advantages—and defects. While eminently readable, there is no index of biblical passages, and the index of subject-matter I have found inadequate. Where the history is important for the literary-criticism, and the reverse, the treatment is apt to be one-sided. Thus the sketch of the Judges passes from Jephthah to Samson, the Philistines and Saul; but this has vital implications for the literary criticism, as also has the view (p. 80) that when David became king at Jerusalem he destroyed the barrier severing the central from the southern tribes of Israel. On the other hand, what Meinhold has to say on recent developements of literary analysis (J^1 and J^2, or J and L) and upon the analysis of Deuteronomic *books* (especially Joshua, p. 212 sq.) is highly instructive.

Here may be mentioned a *Rektoratsrede* at Bonn by Hans Meinhold on the Decalogue (Giessen, 1927). In contrast to a certain tendency to carry back the Decalogue to the beginning of the religious history of Israel—partly on the ground that ethical ideas are found both among primitive people and also in ancient civilizations before the rise of Israel—Meinhold gives reasons for dating it about 600 B.C.; and his pamphlet is fortified by a series of excellent notes which make it, slight though it is, a useful contribution to the problem of the different Decalogues. Mention may also be made of a pamphlet by the Rev. E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., of St Beuno's College, *De Unitate Litteraria Num. xxii* (Rome, 1926). *Inter alia* he argues for the retention of the reading 'the land of the children of his people' (*v.* 5), and against Skinner's remarks (*Genesis*, 396 sq.) on the impossibility of a flock covering 350 miles in seven days.

Das Deuteronomium (Königsberger Schriften, i 6, 1925), by Max Löhr, continues his study of the Hexateuchal problems (see *J. T. S.*, xxvi 327). The Book of the Law consisted of Deut. xvii 8–11, xix 1–12, xxi 1–8, 18–21 a, xxii 13–24, 25–29, and perhaps xxi 22 sq., xxiii 10–15, xxv 5–9 (p. 170). Though not literally of Mosaic origin, it goes back to Moses (p. 199 n. 3), and represents Southern Yahwism as distinct from north Israelite. One may agree with Prof. Löhr that the conflicts between Yahweh and Baal were only a continuation of those that had gone on in earlier days (cf. p. 197), but his arguments for the antiquity of the laws, based upon supposed 'pre-Yahwistic' or 'animistic' conceptions, hardly carry weight (p. 198). Moreover, it is doubtful whether the sacrificial acts of heroic figures like Abraham, Gideon, &c., can be used to prove secular, profane, or non-sacred acts of slaughter before Josiah's time; and the argument that all Israel as a single community came into being with David and disappeared after Solomon is too one-sided (p. 204). In the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Jan. 1906, Prof. Löhr writes an exceedingly valuable little article on the Hexateuch problem which should not be overlooked, for here he clearly recognizes that there was a Pan-Israelite movement in the exilic age (col. 7)! It is one thing to look for a Mosaic kernel of Deuteronomy, and to rely upon one and one only of the estimates of an early united Israel; but when we find, e. g., that the treatment of Aaron in Exod. xxxii and Num. xii is to be explained in the light of post-exilic conditions (col. 12), it will be seen that Löhr, however useful a stick with which to beat the exponents of JEDP—'die vier hexateuchischen Quellenschriften sind Phantome' (*loc. cit.*)—is not leading us back to any conservative view of the Old Testament. If there is much in the Pentateuch which is ancient—and no one has ever denied it—no less are there elements that are quite as ancient in the Elephantine papyri of the fifth century B.C. and in the Talmud.

An illuminating study by Aage Bentzen, *Die Josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen* (Copenhagen, 1926), not only takes notice of Löhr's work on Deuteronomy, but is an example of the present tendency (Max Weber, Lurje, and others) to look for social and economic factors and class differences in the biblical history. He traces a series of provincial 'Levitical' movements culminating in Deuteronomy. Shechem was perhaps the original central sanctuary, the pre-eminence of Jerusalem belongs to the exilic and late age (p. 86). Priestly interests can be recognized in the historical traditions, and theocratic and anti-monarchical developements are to be traced in E and go back before the fall of the northern kingdom. Bentzen's book provokes thought; he is a painstaking writer, and suggestive even where one dissents from him. In Num. xvi sqq. we get, as he points out, a condensation of almost the entire history of the priestly bodies in Israel (p. 105), and some of his most interesting pages are on the Levites or pre-Levitical bodies as historians and editors. The reform of Josiah was, he says, a step in the 'Entstehung des Judentums'; and his aim is to show that the great steps which were to preserve Israel and give it new life were already taken before the political fall of Israel and Judah. Bentzen is throughout interesting, his emphasis upon Shechem as against Jerusalem, upon provincial priesthoods (and especially the Abiathar tradition) as against Zadokites, and such a view as that 'the Levites have *levitisiert* Jeremiah and made him a Deuteronomic preacher' (p. 104) will show that his contribution to biblical studies is not to be ignored.

Otto Eissfeldt, *Die Quellen des Richterbuches* (Leipzig, 1925), is a continuation of his *Hexateuch-Synopse* (1922), and carries on his endeavour to prove that there is good evidence for, as distinct from the late D and P, *three* old sources, J, E, and—the real novelty—L a 'Lay source'. Skinner's review in *J. T. S.*, July, 1923, pp. 433 sqq.—one of the last pieces of Old Testament work that this fine and much-missed scholar accomplished—already indicated the relation between this new theory of 'L' and the earlier views, where the necessity of distinguishing J¹ and J² points to the recognition of conflicting data such as that which has led Eissfeldt to his L and J. And the caution with which Skinner so characteristically expressed himself seems not less necessary now, since literary analysis must be balanced by more synthetic work; and literary-critical and literary-historical questions are so interwoven that each must be checked by the other. Thus Eissfeldt observes that the introductions to Othniel, Ehud, Deborah and Barak, and Samson are not from the same hand as those to Gideon and Abimelech; and that E knows no prophet prior to Jerubbaal, Abimelech, Jephthah, and Samuel. But the position given to the Kenizzite Othniel, the brother of Caleb, cannot be severed from the inclusion of the Calebite and Manahathite figure Manoah the father of Samson. Also, the prominence of Egyptian or Mosaïte tradition in Judges xvii sq. (the priest) cannot be severed from a series of references in 1 Samuel i sqq. (Egyptian priesthood, ii 27; the name Phinehas; also the words in iv 8), and the introduction to Jephthah seems to have been once connected with the story of the rise of Saul (cf. *Ency. Brit.* xxiv p. 124, n. 7). In other words, if we take the narratives as they stand and work back, we at once encounter problems of literary composition which are decidedly of greater primary importance than the acute analysis of separate incidents. In any case, Eissfeldt's study has led him to many interesting conclusions, and he urges that we should speak of a Deuteronomic *Ausgabe*, not a *Redaktion*: RD's share being very small—as Burney also had urged.

We turn next to biblical 'ideas'. Dr Alfred Geden's *The Evangel of the Hebrew Prophets* (Epworth Press, 1926) is, according to the subtitle, 'an exposition and a defence'. It is a sympathetic survey of the prophets and their teaching, their attitude to nature, the use of parable and metaphor, the Old Testament and art, the permanent value of the teaching of the prophets, &c. It covers extensive ground, and the author's wide knowledge of Asiatic religions has enabled him to make valuable remarks upon points of comparison and contrast between them and the Old Testament (pp. 216 sqq.). He notes how Christian thought has 'drifted away from the prophetic position' (p. 242), and discusses the restatement in modern terms of the ideas of the prophets. He justly comments upon that modern confused conception of an 'evolving' God for man's evolving *conceptions* of God (p. 243)—a remarkable twentieth-century confusion comparable to that of the savage who confuses nature with his own ideas. His attitude to biblical criticism is somewhat uncertain; and while he considers the Jeremian authorship of Lamentations improbable (p. 151) and recognizes a Deutero-Isaiah (p. 66), he thinks that critics have taken insufficient account of the traditional conviction that the Law stands at the head of Israel's history (pp. 31 sqq.).

Prof. J. M. Powis Smith, *The Prophets and their Times* (Chicago, 1925), writes an introductory systematic survey with numerous quotations (including the Darius inscription, p. 195). Dealing with Hosea he observes that if Yahweh was not recognized as the God of the harvest after so many centuries of agricultural life, how had he continued to survive as the God of Israel? It was necessary 'to supplant Baal by Yahweh in the whole round of agricultural life', and Hosea's complaint shews that this had not come to pass; how then did Yahweh finally achieve the recognition so long delayed? 'These are', as he truly says, 'problems still awaiting solution' (p. 61). Prof. Powis Smith, with many other scholars, considers that the Servant of the Lord is Israel, sometimes the real Israel, and sometimes spoken of in 'idealistic' terms (p. 188). The author of the Poems was 'a voice crying in the wilderness' (p. 190)—and these words are to be noticed, inasmuch as we are not obliged to assume that the ideas concerning the Servant either conformed to or immediately influenced current ideas. Historical evidence and the prophecies continuously illumine each other, and when the Messianic movement connected with Zerubbabel is rightly emphasized (p. 202 sq.), and the historical data shew that it must have collapsed, we may assume not only that 'the collapse of this Messianic movement was a terrific blow to Jewish faith' (p. 203) but we may ask whether traces both of the earlier period of expectation and the later period of dismay can be found outside those writings (Haggai, Zechariah, &c.) from which we gain these very important starting-points for further study.

Prof. Powis Smith agrees with those who hold that although the book of Daniel is of the Maccabean age the materials in i–vi were in existence for some time previously. Dr. Martin Thilo, *Die Chronologie des Danielbuches* (Bonn, 1926), continuing earlier studies of biblical chronology, attempts an explanation of the figures in Daniel which will interest those attracted by this thorny subject. He deals with the relation between the dates prefixed to visions or prophecies and the contents of the latter. He suggests that Darius the Mede is Gobryas, 'Mede' being a reference to Gutium, and he throws out the attractive view that the dates in Daniel are from a writer of the school responsible for the last redaction of the chronology of the book of Kings, and that this may explain why the book became canonical, and why it was written in Aramaic. The writer, thinks Dr Thilo, lived in Aramaic-speaking circles, wherein apocalyptic ideas circulated, and he finds traces of his interpolations in ii 41–43, vii 8, 11, 20–22, 24 sq. Here may be mentioned the same author's *Das Buch Hiob* (Bonn, 1925), a translation, with the concisest series of exegetical notes, and a discussion of the problems of the book of Job from the point of view of the history of the 'Wisdom' literature. An excellent study of ch. xxviii is among the many suggestive contents of this closely packed booklet.

Dr E. L. Dietrich of Wackernheim bei Maine, in שוב שבות: *Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten* (Beiheft of the *ZATW.*, 1925), shews that the Hebrew phrase does not necessarily refer to captivity or exile (Job xlii 10), though it was readily applicable to a literal 'return'. It means primarily a turn in the tide of things. (For the transitive use of שוב he could have referred to Nöldeke's tentative explanation of the name Shebaniah, *Ency. Biblica*, col. 3286, § 39, cf. col. 4436, n. 1.) It is an eschatological conception, and Dietrich has an interesting survey of the idea of things that are new or recreated: new home for Israel, Exodus, kingdom, Jerusalem, state, David, Moses, Elijah, cult, creation, deluge, Paradise, covenant, &c. There is a return to the old, or the old in a new form: there is progress but without the idea of progress. *Urzeit gleich Endzeit*: it is a theory of the return of the *Urzeit* in the *Endzeit*. The ideas, if encouraged by astral theorizing, are due to the observation of nature, to yearly, monthly, and daily recurrences, and to common psychical facts. The ideas can be traced in the Old Testament and apocalyptical literature; and though in no sense solely Hebrew or Israelite, it is the form which they have taken in biblical literature which gives them lasting importance.

Reference may here be made to an address by Prof. Hans Schmidt, *Der Mythos vom wiederkehrenden König im Alten Testament* (Giessen, 1925). It has special reference to Isa. vii 14 sqq., viii 8, ix 6 sqq., and is particularly valuable for its useful notes, especially on the conception of the first and last Adam. Here again are ideas native to Palestine, and naturally assimilated by the Israelites; and Prof. Schmidt's remarks on the interrelation of ideas of nature and history, and of national destiny and the common welfare of man and beast, bear not only upon ancient religion, but upon our modern theories of the rationale of religious experience and its expression. Some of his arguments for pre-exilic dating require scrutiny; thus the reference to the ass in Gen. xlix 11 can scarcely be taken to prove a pre-monarchical date, on the ground that the horse was unknown (p. 23); nor does one see why the conception of the Return of the King is necessarily *astralmythisch* (p. 33) in origin. On the other hand, he is undoubtedly right in his contention that the Messianic ideas could have arisen only in monarchical conditions, and not in a post-exilic anti-dynastic age (p. 36). In *Gott und das Leid im Alten Testament* (Giessen, 1926), Prof. Schmidt summarizes the leading ideas: sorrow is cleansing and purifying; Yahweh is above and behind all, and he suffers along with his erring people. He adopts Mowinckel's view that the Servant of the Lord is the prophet himself, and warns us not to confuse this with Gunkel's explanation; but although I agree with him that the Servant is not Israel—or rather not *everywhere* Israel—his arguments will perhaps hardly move those who think otherwise (p. 46).

Dr. Wheeler Robinson's lectures, *The Cross of the Servant* (Student Christian Movement, 1926), are distinguished (*a*) by the suggestion that ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε (Phil. ii 7) is derived from Isa. liii 12 and refers to the Cross and not the Incarnation, and (*b*) by the use he makes of the ancient and primitive idea of corporate personality 'to elucidate the conception of the Servant, and the further application of this idea to the New Testament conception of the Body of Christ'. The fact is that one can think of the individual in the collective or of the collective in the individual, and the whole group is a unity present in any one of its members. The conception is a fluid one; so also in Ps. xxii the Psalmist speaks variously as a separate individual with a personality of his own, then as a representative of the group, and finally in terms which suggest the whole nation (pp. 33 sqq.). The conception can contract into a primary reference to Jesus and expand into the doctrine of the Church (p. 77). This being so, it is difficult to see why Dr Wheeler Robinson and other scholars should argue that all the references to the Servant of the Lord in the Deutero-Isaiah have the same content throughout. The Servant-idea was in the air, and later at all events the Servant found 'historic realization' in a succession of Israelites (p. 38). It is true that we have only a national resurrection in Ezek. xxvii and that the resurrection of the individual is not explicit until Dan. xii 3 (p. 63) and it is then that we find the earliest reference to the collective interpretation (p. 53 n.). But if, as I take it, Isa. liii refers to an event that had recently occurred, and to the death of an *individual*, new ideas are not necessarily taken up at once; and, as in Egypt, the conviction of the resurrection (or life after death) of a man of impressive personality (like the Pharaoh) precedes the conviction of that of important individuals of lesser standing. Isa. liii seems to me to mark a new stage in Israelite religion; and the individual is not the prophet, the writer, but a martyr whose significance the prophet was one of the few to recognize.[1] Space forbids further comment, but attention must certainly be drawn here to the very admirable work which Dr Wheeler Robinson is doing on the *psychological* interpretation of the Old Testament. New though this is, it is of course not to be confused with the 'New Psychology' which next claims a hearing.

The New Psychology and the Bible is a lecture by Major J. W. Povah, B.D., the author of a *Study of the Old Testament* (see *J. T. S.* xxvi 323 sq.), *The New Psychology and the Hebrew Prophets* (1925), and *The Old Testament and Modern Problems in Psychology* (1926; all published by Longmans). These are simple and interesting expositions of the subject, especially valuable for their defence against the attacks of certain psychoanalysts upon Christianity, but weakened somewhat by the absence of indexes. There is much that one could single out: the necessity of facing one's stumbling-blocks, the impossibility of sublimating an instinct unless its existence is recognized, the tendency to obscure the true reasons for one's beliefs and disbeliefs, the probability that the prophets did not always know the full meaning of that which had broken forth from a deeper level than their conscious minds (viz. the Servant Songs, *Modern Problems*, p. 43 sq.). But the New Psychology—ready to ask whether it has rediscovered the Gospel (p. 25 of the Lecture)—goes too far when Dr Crichton Miller, in a foreword to the *Hebrew Prophets*, considers that the story of Elijah and the cave on Mount Horeb in 1 Kings xix 'before was historical and outside ourselves' but now 'treated from the point of view of analytical psychology presents an intensely personal problem'.

---

[1] For this I must refer further to the *Camb. Ancient History*, iii, 488 sqq., where examples are given of the features to which Dr Robinson refers: the group, as a person, and a person as the representative or embodiment of the group; cf. *ib.* p. 453 sq. on the king, and to the examples on p. 493 add also Wells *God the Invisible King* p. 115 (the ego as mankind), Sir Francis Younghusband in *The Quest* xv 373 (the English official in Africa as embodying England).

For, on the one hand, the whole *religious* value of Old Testament narrative has always lain in the relation between the problems of human souls of to-day and of ancient Israel; and, on the other hand, analytical psychology with its caves and wombs, &c., &c., can hardly be regarded as a serious contribution to our exegesis of the Bible.

What is said of Infantilism and the refusal to face God, or even to face oneself, contains, every one will admit, a very profound truth, but it is only part of the truth; and the exponents have no very clear idea of what is involved in or related to the conception of Nirvana, nor do they appear to recognize the difference between their 'Infantilism' and that childlike faith and trust and that refuge in God which has been the mainstay of men who were far from weaklings. Again, as regards what is said of sexual symbols (serpent, Moses' rod, cup, cross), Major Povah gives us the impression that although a sexual meaning may not occur to us the symbol arose from a subconscious sexual meaning and may in turn suggest one. Thus, he says, that stories for children should be carefully selected in accordance with the meaning subconsciously suggested by them (*Modern Problems*, p. 34 sq.). But one finds it impossible to see how one can prevent the most innocent symbol from being misinterpreted more or less *consciously* by those who, like some psychoanalysts, appear to be obsessed by sexual symbolism. Major Povah, it is true, would dissociate himself from the vagaries of psychoanalysis; but he appears to approve of Freud's theory of the murder of the primal father and the horror of incest and parricide (*Hebrew Prophets*, 34 sq.). This is one of the most extraordinary examples of modern myth-making that one could well imagine, and a story which, we are sure, Major Povah would not select for children; but he has a no less remarkable explanation to account for the horse's fear of puddles and the child's fear of darkness (*ib.* p. 82). From the psychoanalytical point of view there is much in the Old Testament that appears in a new light, but writers who understand that standpoint are more likely to contribute to our knowledge of the Israelite soul than those who read the Old Testament through psychoanalytical spectacles.

It will not be denied that a student of psychoanalysis will approach the Old Testament with a deeper knowledge of human nature; the marriage-relationship between Yahweh and Israel will, in itself, afford abundant material and, in the story of Hosea's marriage, his powers of analysis will be put to the test. Major Povah devotes some pages to this, and Adolf Allwohn, of Walldorf, has made it the subject of a monograph: *Die Ehe des Propheten Hosea in psychoanalytischer Beleuchtung* (Beiheft xliv of the *ZATW.*). He explicitly dissociates himself from the Freudian theory of the sexual origin of religion, nor is he entirely satisfied with Major Povah's treatment (p. 57 n.). He gives a thorough and valuable exegesis of Hosea i–iii, and, after a discussion of the many interpretations, proceeds to unfold his own. Hosea had a strong sexual bent and was attracted by the sensuous Baal cults, he married a whore (apparently not a *ḳedēshah*, as Prof. Schmidt has suggested), and, torn between physical love for Gomer and his worship of Yahweh, lived as it were in two worlds, until he found a synthesis in Yahweh as a god of spiritual love. Allwohn's conclusions are bound up with an exegesis into which there is no space to enter here; and a discussion would involve some account of the different traditions of the early relations between Yahweh and Israel, the beliefs in the causes of human and natural fertility, and the traces of later editorial hands in the present arrangement of chap. i–iii. This must be reserved for another occasion. It must suffice to point out that if Hosea's temperament is supposed to explain his marriage and subsequent experiences, the psychoanalysts must also consider the sexual imagery employed by Jeremiah (ii sq., v) who was unmarried (xvi 21),—one can see the line they would take here—and the stronger language of Ezekiel (xvi, xxiii), who was forbidden to lament the death of his beloved wife 'the desire of his eyes' (xxiv 15 sqq.). To put it otherwise, the marked sexuality of the Hebrew is undoubtedly of great significance for the interpretation of early life and thought in Palestine, but it is difficult to understand how the specific and characteristic standpoint of the psychoanalyst throws light upon Hosea i–iii; indeed it is a little astonishing that psychoanalysts should approach this particular narrative without taking into account the conceptions of intimate union and apostasy which we find in both Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It is the unmarried Jeremiah who speaks of the youthful innocence of Israel, it is the evidently happily married Ezekiel who looks back on an Israel who was faithless and unclean from the very first.

We return to the 'old' psychology, and in a new form, in *Israel: its life and culture*, by Prof. Johs. Pedersen of Copenhagen (Oxford, 1926). In a rather informal manner, though with an abundance of evidence behind him, the author deals with the social conditions and the ideas that make or mar social solidarity: ideas of soul, blessing, peace, covenant and salvation, righteousness, truth and justice, sin and curse, life and death. He is at pains to shew that these are more than verbal ideas; they take active, practical, pregnant forms which manifest themselves in men's attitude to one another and to God. He is dealing with the ideas that operate more or less unconsciously, systematizing and making explicit what is implicit in life and thought. What he has to say, e. g., upon Righteousness is extremely suggestive, and can be confirmed by arguments along other lines (cf. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, 3rd ed., pp. 655 sqq.). His analysis of the conflict between David and Saul, the heartless treachery of Jonathan (from Saul's standpoint), and the curious complexity of David's character, will at least provoke thought. His view that Gen. xxxiv and Joshua ix are *not* composite from a psychological point of view is also instructive, emphasizing as it does the unity of the compiler rather than that of the constituents of the compilation. The book is undoubtedly the most original and the most stimulating contribution of recent years to a deeper knowledge of the Old Testament, and being simply written and with numerous quotations, it can be readily grasped. It may, however, seem too mystical to some, and it is perhaps as well to point out that if we may speak of 'corporate personality' or of 'esprit de corps', of the 'soul' of a people, or of its 'psychic' unity, then Prof. Pedersen is dealing with the *psychical* aspects of social stability and of social vicissitudes. The terminology may seem old-fashioned compared with that of the 'New' Psychology; but those who will make the necessary concession will be repaid, for who could find a more absorbing study for modern needs than an enquiry into what constitutes the 'soul' of a people and all that makes for its welfare?

The study of the Bible from advanced social-political standpoints has already been undertaken (e.g. by Max Weber), and to Dr Lurje of Moscow we now owe *Studien zur Geschichte der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Verhältnisse im Israelitisch-Jüdischen Reiche von der Einwanderung in Kanaan bis zum Babylonischen Exil* (Beiheft 45 of the *ZATW.*, 1927). Characteristically enough it has the Marxian motto: the history of society is that of class-warfare; and in this pamphlet (64 pages) Dr Lurje deals with communal and private property, trade and industry, government and taxation, class differences, the proletariat and slavery, social movements, civil war and revolution. We read that Omri's party was the agrarian, Tibni's that of the town-capitalists or else of the proletariats, Jehu's rise was that of the Yahweh-party against the oppressors of the people: such views are at least suggestive. The prophets were not democrats in a real sense, or representatives of the poor; they were for the aristocracy rather than the proletariat: Dr Lurje does not grasp the fact that the prophets were working for new men rather than new institutions. Deuteronomy certainly marks an advance, but there was no internal amelioration, and with a rapid paragraph on the decline and fall of Judah, Dr Lurje reaches the limits of his task. Thus he leaves off where the really interesting part begins, he has no place for the democratic note in the popular history and religion, or for the ideal of the 'holiness' of all the people. He takes no wide view embracing the reconstruction of Israel and the continuity which lay beneath the discontinuity, still less of the significance of the internal developement of Israel for world-history, and for the history of those ideas which in the long run have directly or indirectly stimulated religious, ethical, and social reforming movements. It is, in fact, entirely characteristic that with all the careful summarizing of the biblical data within the period selected—and for this he has our thanks—there is no profundity, no philosophical conception of movements which, whatever the Left may think of them, brought about permanent progressive developement. And that is why the Bible is, or should be, so uniquely significant for any deeper study of the facts and factors of social-political history.

The recently published Egyptian papyrus with the Teaching of Amen-em-ope has placed the study of the 'Wisdom Literature' upon a new footing (see *J.T.S.* xxvi 321). Dr Oesterley, in *The Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament* (S.P.C.K., 1927), has been able to utilize the latest Egyptological research upon this difficult papyrus, and has taken into account the admirable article by the late Prof. Gressmann on the subject and a recent study by Prof. J. D. Simpson. The papyrus is noteworthy for its close relationship with Prov. xxii 17–xxiii 14, and for points of contact with passages in Deuteronomy, the Psalms, Ben Sira, and the story of Ahikar. The lofty religious note which has been claimed for it constitutes perhaps its most marked feature; and it has raised the question whether, instead of the debt being on the side of Palestine, Hebrew or more precisely Israelite influence has left its mark on Egypt. Semitic (Hebrew, &c.) influence in Egypt can be traced in the fourteenth–twelfth century B.C.; and the earlier Story of Sinuhe, in common with the archaeological data, allows us to see how Egyptians and Hebrews (Semites, Asiatics, &c.) could or did influence one another. The Amarna Letters and Egyptian evidence—for example Merneptah's 'Israel' stela with its almost Hebraic prelude (Breasted, iii § 616)—point to a certain community of thought, and the precise explanation of the relationship between Amen-em-ope and the sections in Proverbs is not easily determined. Dr Oesterley is rather too inclined to lay stress upon 'Israelite' to the exclusion of Hebrew or Palestinian thought (pp. 26, 94 sq.), but his argument that both sources go back to an older Hebrew collection deserves consideration (p. 105). In any case he has provided us with the material for an opinion, and we are under an obligation not only to him but to the Egyptologist, Prof. Ll. Griffith, for its fullness.

Dr A. Jeremias, *Jüdische Frömmigkeit* (No. 2 of the *Religionswissenschaftliche Darstellungen für die Gegenwart*, Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1927), writes on the spirit of modern Judaism. He touches upon the Torah as Israel's portable inheritance, the cemetery and the reunion of the living and the dead, the dead as intermediaries, spiritual tendencies, and assimilationist movements new and old, Spengler's diagnosis of

Judaism, and a variety of other interesting points. The Jews are Semites only in a linguistic sense; Jewish financial ability is pre-Christian, and there is something mystical about gold and international finance; the ghetto is a normal feature, and Jewish children remarkably precocious. Dr Jeremias illustrates the inevitable complexity even of so homogeneous a unit as Judaism; and both directly and indirectly illustrating the past from the present and the present from the past, makes the point *inter alia* that Hellenistic Judaism presupposes an Oriental Hellenism (p. 57). Dr Jeremias invites criticisms and suggestions (5 Schreberstrasse, Leipzig).

Dr Samuel Daiches reprints from the *Jewish Chronicle Supplement* (*a*) the view that Isa. xxviii 5–22 refers to spiritualistic séances, communion with the dead, and, possibly, table-moving, and (*b*) the argument that Judges v 2–11, is an introduction to the main part of the poem, and does not refer to the war with Canaan. From Dr Hartwig Hirschfeld (*Jews' College Publications*, No. 9) we have an account of Hebrew grammarians and lexicographers of the ninth–sixteenth centuries; it is an interesting survey with numerous quotations, some hitherto unpublished. Timely aids for young Hebraists are provided by the *Einzelwörterbücher zum Alten Test.* (Giessen); at present they comprise Genesis (by Baumgärtel), Isaiah (by Hempel), Jeremiah (by Rudolph), also Psalms by (Herrmann). The vocabularies contain—very properly—references to Gesenius, Bauer-Leander, &c.; but it is a pity that the publishers did not take a hint from Brünnow's *Chrestomathie* and the American *Semitic Study Series* and give the meanings in both German and English.

Turning to history, one is struck by the keen interest in that most problematic of all periods, Israel's Sojourn in Egypt and the Exodus. Perhaps the most readable of introductions is that of Prof. Alexis Mallon, of the Institut Biblique Pontifical, whose monograph on *Les Hébreux en Égypte* (Rome, 1921), with its forty-seven illustrations, contains a useful collection of interesting matter, and casts its vote for Merneptah as the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The Rev. J. W. Jack's study *The Date of the Exodus in the light of External Evidence* (Clark, Edinburgh, 1925) is the best equipped as regards material, it is a scholarly well-written argument, and it merits careful attention. His view is that Thotmes III is the Pharaoh of the oppression, the Ḥabiru who attacked Abdi-khiba of Jerusalem are the Israelites who entered Palestine from the south, while the entrance under Joshua from the east is part of the invasion of the Sa-Gaz against whose intrusion the other Amarna Letters complain. The argument is worked out elaborately, but I find it inconclusive. It is true that both Hebrews ('Eber) and Ḥabiru are old and extensive terms, and it is possible that 'Abraham' represents an early Hebrew movement into Palestine, and that 'Jacob' points to a later one which settled in Shechem. Mr Jack thinks that the Jacob or 'Israelite' section predominated over their kinsmen (p. 142 sq.); then, *some* Israelites—some only (p. 17)—migrated to Egypt about the beginning of the Hyksos period (*c.* 1875 B.C.), and became known to the Egyptians as 'Hebrews'. They remained there four 'generations', which Mr Jack interprets as 'ages'; but the biblical estimate is consistent if we reckon from Levi to Moses, Reuben to Dathan, Judah to the father of Achan the contemporary of Joshua (p. 217), and to these we must add the statement that Joseph lived to see the children of his grandson Machir who was the conqueror of Gilead (Gen. l 23, Num. xxxii). However that may be, we descend to *c.* 1445 when the people escape to Kadesh and await an opportunity to conquer the land of their ancestors. The Amarna Letters and the Biblical data have now to be combined. But the Ḥabiru, i.e. Hebrews (or Israelites), who threaten Abdi-khiba are evidently attacking the land of their ancestors and kinsmen, yet Mr Jack objects to another of the possible theories, namely an attack by Israelites, *c.* 1200, upon 'their own kindred' the Ḥabiru who had entered previously. Again, his theory distinguishes the southern Hebrew or Israelite invaders from those who were under Joshua, yet both, on his own showing, must have lived together in Egypt and at Kadesh. Joshua's Israelites are supposed to be in touch with the Sa-Gaz under the great Amorite rebel Abd-Ashirta, and they join hands with their kinsmen in Central Palestine (pp. 151 sqq.). But if we grant that the two invading bands of Israel found old allies and kinsmen in Palestine, the Amarna Letters shew that they move along the usual trade-routes, and the anti-Egyptian and pro-Ḥebrew (Israelite?) intrigues are in the big towns. Thus Israel would find plenty of adherents in the land of its ancestors, and especially among the important cities. This seems plausible. No doubt we may suppose that the Amorite chieftain was raising the population against Egyptian overlords and nominees and Mitannian dynasts; but can we associate with this the vicissitudes of Israel? The biblical evidence is admittedly conflicting: either Israel's conquest was speedy and practically complete within a few years, or, as Mr Jack recognizes, there was a gradual settlement, and the people lived away from the beaten track (cf. p. 81). Yet it suits his theory to suppose that Hebron, Beersheba, Bethel, and Gibeon were in the hands of the invaders—that is why none of the Amarna Letters are from these towns (p. 157)—and also to infer that Beth-shan was occupied by them (p. 240), although this city did not really become Israelite till David's time (p. 74). As a matter of fact the external evidence suggests that even in Seti's time, while the south was still firmly in—or perhaps once more in—Egyptian hands, Beth-shan was threatened by an enemy from the north and a steady downward movement characterizes the external history of the whole period. From the Merneptah stela Mr Jack infers that there was an organized powerful confederacy, Israel; it was non-territorial—one may compare the use of the name Moab in later times—and he naturally recognizes the two belts of important non-Israelite cities which, according to the biblical evidence, severed central Palestine from north and south (p. 73). But Merneptah's Israel is scarcely a tripartite collection of tribes; and if it is solely a central Palestinian confederation, what becomes of the Hebrews or Israelites in the district of Judah and Simeon? The external evidence suggests that there was a strong Amorite power under the patronage of the Cappadocian Ḥatti, and that after their downfall there was a 'Philistine' domination, and only after its overthrow could there be any important and independent Hebrew (or Israelite) power. The Amarna Letters point to well-organized 'Hebrew' conditions (religion, language, phraseology, &c.), and to the prominence of Shamash, Hadad (Baal) before the entrance of Ḥabiru and Sa-Gaz; and how Yahweh became the predominant god and Israel the predominant people of Palestine are problems that still await a plausible solution.

That there were great sweeping movements towards the close of the second millennium is evident on a variety of grounds and Dr D. G. Hogarth in the Schweich Lectures for 1924 deals with *The Kings of the Hittites* (Oxford, 1926), and the gulf between (*a*) the North Syrian and South Hittite principalities, and (*b*) the earlier empire of the Cappadocian Ḥatti. He is concerned primarily with the archaeological gap: with the second settlement at the great trading-centre of Carchemish, with the introduction of cremation and iron, and with Cypriote connexions, and with the intrusion of bearded Aramaeans in North Syria. The question arises whether after the downfall of Ḥatti and Mitannian power fragments of the old culture were blended with that of Moskhi tribes and of Aramaeans from the east, the result being the curious Syrian culture that is more or less contemporary with the early Hebrew kingdoms. One is ready to suppose that the strong pro-Assyrian tendencies which facilitated the westward expansion of Assyria were due to the advance-guard intrusion of Aramaeans, and the rise of the important kingdom of Damascus is certainly a historical factor of importance. Dr Hogarth has limited himself to the cultural problems, and has provided invaluable material; but from the purely historical side one would like to know more as to what lies behind such a name as 'Panammu' in the Zenjirli inscriptions, or the beautiful inscription in North-Semitic script but of unknown language (? akin to Lycian) also from Zenjirli; and in view of the Indo-Iranian traces in the

Amarna period (the gods Varuna, &c., the names Suryadata, Artamana, &c.), one feels that here too is a factor to be taken into consideration in the attempt to recover some lost pages of history. We seem to know a good deal about the Amarna Age; but it is astonishing how fragmentary, unequal, and awkwardly distributed is our knowledge of the age, say from the Judges to the rise of Omri.

In the Schweich Lectures for the preceding year Dr Gaster dealt at length with *The Samaritans, Their History, Doctrines, and Literature* (Oxford, 1925). The volume with appendices and nineteen illustrations is the fruit of many years' labour, and is a store of curious and valuable information. He takes a conservative attitude to the Pentateuch, holding that as the Samaritans accepted the Pentateuch alone, the Prophets and Hagiographa were not yet in existence. He very justly emphasizes the sympathetic treatment of northern Israel by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and even suggests that Ezekiel was one of the northern scribes and selected, not Jerusalem, but a central Palestinian locality for the Temple. Dr Gaster attaches much more importance to Samaritan tradition than most scholars do; and even if he has gone too far here, he at least impresses upon us the necessity of considering the part played by Samaritans when Jewish animosity refused them a hearing or encouraged malevolent traditions. Dr Gaster has the merit of endeavouring to rehabilitate the Samaritans, and the judicious reader will find much that is novel (e. g. his view of the story in the Letter of Aristeas, p. 118) and suggestive. It is interesting to find that the *pasek* line in the Hebrew text occurs, in Joshua at least, where the Samaritan Book of Joshua has a different text (p. 136); and what is said of Jewish and Samaritan sects in Palestine, Persia, and the lands of the Diaspora enables one to realize how very naturally there would be strange tendencies, distinctly Hebraic (or Judaic), yet far from orthodox, and how the curious blend of Old Testament and other 'Biblical' features which we find in the Odes of Solomon, or later in Mandaean, are only a few of the many blends which must have prevailed.

Prof. Walter Otto's *Kulturgeschichte des Altertums* (Beck, Munich, 1925) has grown out of a series of reviews of works on the history and developement of the ancient Near East. It has become one of the outstanding works on the economic and other aspects of the interaction between East and West; and, covering a wide field and with a good command of the material, it has proved extremely stimulating to biblical scholars, orientalists, and to all interested in the great factors in the rise and fall of civilizations. Strongest upon the art and the economic sides, it is throughout suggestive, whether commenting upon England and Rome (p. 138 n.), or the treatment of Egyptian economic conditions by the anti-Bolshevik Rostovtzeff (p. 136; cf. above Lurje on the Israelite proletariat), or the influence of Phoenicians and their successors in the Mediterranean (p. 49 sq.), &c. Hellenism was no more a unified activity than was the Oriental reaction that followed it; and the new efforts to understand the Oriental activity (of which Christianity was one, though the most successful, phase) supplement Oswald Spengler's emphasis upon the Arabian phase of cultural history, and shew more truly that it begins with Persia. Antiochus I of Commagene of the first century B.C. is a symptom of Iranian-Greek fusion, and Otto has valuable remarks upon the depth of Greek influence in one place and the absence of it in another, pointing out that the New Testament is not Greek but *Orientalisch-griechisches Mischgut* (p. 127 n.). His broad survey of the *Ausgang der Antike* is the more interesting as he recognizes that many factors were at work, and that Christianity—and notably St Augustine—unites the old world and the new: *die letzten Ausklänge des Hellenismus und die ersten des Mittelalters vereinen sich in ihm zu einer Melodie.* There is much that invites comment, and one must content oneself with the observation that Otto sees no *necessity* in human history, warning us that the historian who is overcome by groundless fears after his survey of the past can in times of decline contribute to that decline.

Dr Rendel Harris reprints from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (July, 1926) an essay on 'the Early Colonists of the Mediterranean', wherein he argues for (1) South Arabian colonization in Egypt (on the strength of spices and cowries), (2) Egypt colonization in the Aegean and Syrian coast (papyrus trade), and (3) Hittite colonies in the Mediterranean, and possibly migrations to the Rhine. Prof. W. H. Worrell, *A Study of Races in the Ancient Near East* (Heffer, Cambridge, 1927), presents much miscellaneous and interesting information on the religion, history, language, and racial traits of the Hamites and Semites. In his Preface he suggests that 'the most archaic Semitic speech is no more than an early offshoot of a trunk whose branches even now flourish all over Africa'. With this type of speech went a race whom he is tempted to find in the builders of Stonehenge and the dolmens of Brittany. He gives a number of illustrations of Semitic ethnical types which alone are of no little interest.

Dr Ditlef Nielsen, who has for many years devoted himself to the study of the ancient pre-Islamic Arabic of the Minaean and Sabaean inscriptions, has begun to publish an extensive semi-popular synthesis of their contents. The *Handbuch der altarabischen Altertumskunde*, vol. i (Copenhagen, 1927), makes a splendid volume of 272 pages, quarto, with 76 illustrations, and is intended for the general reader, while two volumes will follow containing the most important inscriptions with commentary, grammar, and dictionary. The present volume contains a sketch, necessarily fragmentary and speculative, of the fifteen or more centuries of history of South Arabia by the veteran Hommel, and an excellent account of public life, trade and commerce, organization, &c., by Prof. Rhodokanakis. Prof. Adolf Grohmann writes on the architecture, sculpture, and general archaeology, pointing out, *inter alia*, the varying influence of Egypt and Greece, and the reaction against Hellenistic art which we also find in Coptic and Islamic monuments. Dr Neilsen himself is responsible for an introductory chapter which surveys the history of the study and the growth of material (pp. 1–56), and for the concluding chapter on the religion (pp. 177–250). It is interesting to recall the Islamic fanaticism towards the old Arabian culture, the loss of the old genuine tradition and the rise of a more or less 'canonical' literary tradition (p. 178 sq.). The Arabs had no intelligent knowledge of the old religion, though the Koran and Arab writers throw some light on the contemporary heathenism. Years ago Nöldeke shewed how recent and unreliable were the Arab traditions of Amalek; and Old Testament criticism would to well to bear in mind the evidence which Arabia provides for the disappearance of a civilization which it has been left for this age to begin to recover, and for the growth of traditions which prove to be, in a sense, 'canonical', and relatively recent. What Dr Nielsen has to say on the old Arabian religion must be taken with his study *Der dreieinige Gott* (Copenhagen, 1922). It is not generally known that the divine name Yah seems to occur in the Liḥyan personal names 'Azar-yah and 'Aus-yah (gift of Y., p. 243), and, while he has much that is of interest concerning relations between Israel and ancient Arabia, the view that Yahu or Yahweh came from north-western Arabia (Kadesh, Sinai, p. 245), although held by various authorities (Ed. Meyer, &c.), does not seem to me so sound as the view that thence came a reforming movement which brought a new spirit into the old Yahwism. The remaining volumes of Dr Nielsen's great work will be awaited with keen interest.

The fourth volume of Dr Peter Thomsen's *Die Palästina-Literatur* (Hinrichs, Leipzig) covers the literature from 1915 to 1924. His exhaustive survey of everything bearing upon Palestinian study has, for some years past, been indispensable to students in a variety of fields, and with every new volume fresh features are added. This volume, for example, includes a full bibliography of Hittite studies, and of Roman-Byzantine research. Modern Palestine receives its share of attention, including commerce, English administration, Zionist and anti-Zionist literature It would be difficult to find anything relating to ancient medieval and modern Palestine published from 1895 (the *terminus a quo*) and onwards which is not recorded in this series. The present volume contains 670 pages and about 80 pages of index.

Obviously a work of this scope could only be accomplished by co-operation, and Dr Thomsen has the support of learned societies, co-helpers in various countries, or for special subjects; and he invites writers to send copies of articles and publications to his address: Dresden—A. 19, Laubestrasse 11. It should be mentioned that, besides putting students of Palestine under his debt by this laborious undertaking, he is responsible for a number of excellent articles on Palestinian archaeology, &c., in the new *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte.*

Few names have carried so much weight in the study of Semitic religions as that of Wolf Wilhelm Graf von Baudissin whose death in February, 1926, removed a veteran who, though nearly eighty years of age, was actively engaged upon a great work on the use of *kurios* as a divine name. The *Gedächtnisrede* by Prof. Sellin (Giessen, 1926) together with Prof. Eissfeldt's valuable survey and bibliography in the *ZDMG.* lxxx (since reprinted) testify to the influence exerted by one whom it is natural to mention along with Robertson Smith, Wellhausen, and the still happily spared Lagrange as the great names in the study of Semitic religion. Baudissin slowly developed in his attitude towards modern Old Testament criticism; he was impressed by the antiquity of the leading ideas in Palestine, holding, for example, that the roots of the belief in a resurrection go back to genuine Hebrew thought. Characterized by a certain solidity and weight of learning, and by the patient and laborious accumulation of great masses of detail, he stands in contrast to Hugo Gressmann, another great and well-known figure, whose more recent and tragically sudden loss, while at the height of his powers, all students of Palestinian religion will deplore. Original, versatile, fertile in suggestion, no one could fail to be stimulated by Gressmann's genius, even though the paths towards which he directed them led to conclusions different from his own. An entirely new edition of his *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament* in two fine volumes (Gruyter, Berlin, 1927) is perhaps his most solid achievement, and is quite indispensable for those who want first-hand information on the external evidence.

Various introductions to the study of religions have been written, and Dr Theodore Robinson of Cardiff in his *Outline Introduction to the History of Religions* (Milford, 1926) has aimed at presenting a series of concise sketches of the chief religions in order to illustrate the general tendencies from primitive religion to a Christianity which is not in its final form. Whatever form the world's final religion may take, it is worth while studying its history up to the present, since thereby we can see how religions are born, develope, and die (p. vii). The death of religions in the past and the birth and revival of religions are alike stubborn facts, and every writer has to steer a way between the two extremes of giving undue preference to Christianity and of adopting too cold and unsympathetic an attitude towards it, if not towards religion in general. Dr Robinson's book is handy, simple, and covers much ground. His account of Christian idealism is extremely effective, and his treatment throughout makes the book highly suitable as an introduction. In the second edition an index would be an advantage.

Another introductory book is *This Believing World*, by Lewis Browne (Benn, London, 1927). How shall one describe it? It contains a great deal about the world's religions, but a more unconventional book one can scarcely conceive. If we have not the drama of religion, it is not unfair to say that Mr Browne gives us a cinema view, with unmistakeable letter-press dancing before the eyes. History in head-lines, religion in relief. It gives a more unbiased picture than many a more sober work, and the errors—such as the rise of religion out of fear—are not worse than those in more formal and systematic compilations. Readers must not be frightened by the pictures of 'idols grotesque beyond words' (p. 164), of the unfortunate Bridget (p. 295), or of Saul of Tarsus (p. 280). And the 'animated maps' serve a purpose, e. g. that of the Near East with the notice-board 'Arabian desert; unsafe for Travel' (p. 234), or the entry into Palestine (p. 225), 'here go the Hebrews'—and one almost looks for 'here be quails'. Or one reads of the followers of our Lord, of the 'blear-eyed publicans'. . . . After all, the books *on* religion are part of the history *of* religion.

The series *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch*, edited by Prof. Bertholet (Tübingen), contains a well-selected and annotated collection of texts (in translation) illustrating the various religions. These include, Zoroastrianism: the Avesta, by Geldner of Marburg (54 pp.); the Slavs, by Brückner of Berlin (43 pp.); the Greeks, by Martin Nilsson of Lund (96 pp.); the Romans, by Kurt Latte of Basel (94 pp,); and the Chinese, by Erich Schmitt of Berlin (110 pp.). To readers of the *J. T. S.* Prof. Latte's collection will be of special interest inasmuch as about three-fourths deals with the syncretistic cults. The Oriental cults are illustrated from the usual classical texts, inscriptions, papyri, &c., from the Acts of Thomas, Poimandres, the Odes of Solomon, &c.; its price is 4.30 M, subscription price 3.90.

The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life (Columbia Univ. Press, 1926) is a monograph by Dr Jal Pavry, sometime lecturer in Indo-Iranian languages, Columbia. It is a discussion of the evidence contained in the Gathās, the Later Avesta and subsequent literature, referring to the experiences of the righteous and of the wicked soul during the first three nights after death. It considers the influence of Zoroastrianism upon the Manichaean and Mandaean beliefs, and with full quotations, critical notes, and bibliographical references, provides a very welcome contribution. There are various Zoroastrian concepts—for example *daēna*—(p. 28 sq.) of the first importance for the understanding of the psychology and ideology of a religion which is of admitted importance for the later history of biblical religion; and Dr Pavry gives chapter and verse for all his evidence.

Space permits only the barest mention of M. Francesco Lanzoni's *Genesi Svolgimento e Tramonto delle Legende storiche* (Rome, 1925), a critical study of the nature of legends, their growth and psychological characteristics, the part they play in history, their decay, and so forth. With innumerable examples, biblical and others, and with good bibliography and index, this volume of 300 pages, dedicated to Cardinal Gasquet, contains much that is of real interest to the patient reader. We pass from the general to the particular in the study by Charles Allyn Williams of the *Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite* (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, May, 1925, Nov., 1926). This is 'the Theme of the hairy solitary in its early forms, with reference to Die Legende von Sanct Johanne Chrysostomo', and Mr Williams's monograph surveys all possible Christian and pre-Christian parallels. He gives reasons for deriving them from primitive stories of the seduction by a mortal woman of a beast-man, or more specifically, a god of fertility, which were subsequently modified into the seduction of pious hermits and men with magical powers. No doubt diverse factors go to the construction and to the modification of the more or less closely interrelated stories, and it is perhaps simpler to classify the different recognizable ideas than to trace the course of their developement. But in any case the monograph contains a great deal of interesting matter—e.g., the Babylonian Gilgamesh story, the background of Gen. ii sq., the story of Samson—wherein the curious can delve.

In the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. xii (1926), Prof. Canney writes on 'the Magic of Tears'. He concludes that the purpose of wailing, &c., is often not merely to express grief but to bring back the dead, the copious tears not merely demonstrate sorrow, but 'reanimate, and revitalize the dead by bathing them in a creative and life-giving fluid'. The journal also includes a lecture by the late Dr Casartelli, Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford, on the 'Dog and Death'. In it the eminent Iranian scholar discusses the dog's supposed keenness of vision and the 'four-eyed dog' (viz. with bright yellow spots under the eyes which resemble extra eyes—a case from Lapland), and other curious data. The Bishop, who was a pupil at Louvain of de Harlez, was well known in Oriental circles, and was to have been present at the *Semaine internationale d'Ethnologie religieuse* held at Milan in September, 1925. The proceedings of this, the fourth session of its kind, have been published (Geuthner, Paris, 1926) and contain a page of homage to the venerable scholar. The session itself was conducted along the same lines as that at Tilbourg (see *J. T. S.*, xxvii 331): general papers on method, &c. (by Pinard de la Boullaye, Lindvorsky, Gatti, Padavoni, Wunderle, &c.), while the special papers dealt with (*a*) morals, and (*b*) the idea of redemption. The former covered primitive peoples (Malagasy, &c.) and an interesting survey of the moral ideas in Egypt of the Greco-Roman period (Calderini); in the latter notice was taken of primitive peoples (Schmidt), Mazdaism (Pestalozza), Buddhism (Ballini), the Osiris-cult (Junker), with special attention to Greco-Roman paganism (Allo, Garagnani, Ruch). The tendencies (anti-evolutionary, emphasis upon Supreme Gods among primitive peoples, &c.) have already been commented on (*J. T. S.* xxvii 332 sqq.).

STANLEY A. COOK.

RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

(1) English.

The Church Quarterly Review, July 1927 (Vol. civ, No. 208: S.P.C.K.). A. C. **Headlam** A defence of the new Prayer Book—F. E. **Brightman** The new Prayer Book examined—J. E. **MacRae** The Scottish Liturgy—H. N. **Bate** The world conference of faith and order—A. **Chandler** Christian experience—E. **Vincent** The early Latitudinarians—M. E. **Sandbach-Marshall** Herder's contribution to nineteenth-century thought—T. E. **Robinson** The seventh-century Prophets—F. **Torm** A note on the Synoptic problem—J. H. **Beibitz** Lockton's three traditions in the Gospels—W. K. **Lowther Clarke** Some old books—Short Notices.

The Hibbert Journal, July 1927 (Vol. xxv, No. 4: Constable & Co.). A. **Lobanow-Rostovsky** The problem of authority—L. **Sturzo** The modern conscience and the right of war—W. **Haas** Political education—J. M. **Murry** The metaphysic of Poetry—H. N. **Wieman** Professor Whitehead's concept of God—F. S. **Marvin** Harriet Martineau: triumph and tragedy—E. A. **Baker** Light literature in public libraries—A. **Harrison** The matriarchal State—J. D. **Unwin** Monogamy as a condition of social energy—W. B. **Selbie** The Lausanne conference—J. F. **Newton** The higher fatalism—E. **Lyttelton** A challenge to public schools—E. B. **Castle** The schools of the future—V. **Taylor** The Fourth Gospel and some recent criticism—Survey and Signed Reviews.

(2) American.

The Princeton Theological Review, July 1927 (Vol. xxv, No. 3: Princeton University Press). R. D. **Wilson** Evidence in Hebrew diction for the dates of documents—W. H. **Gutton** The Virgin Birth of our Lord—J. O. **Boyd** The Davidic Covenant: the oracle—E. M. **Wilson** The Second Coming of Christ in the Thessalonian Epistles—W. E. **Hogg** The founding of the second temple—Reviews.

(3) French and Belgian.

Revue Bénédictine, July 1927 (Vol. xxxix, No. 3: Abbaye de Maredsous, Belgium). D. **De Bruyne**, A. **Rome**, A. **Wilmart**, E. A. **Lowe** *Membra disiecta*—M. **Cappuyns** L'auteur du 'De Vocatione omnium gentium'—U. **Berlière** L'exercice du ministère paroissial par

les moines dans le haut Moyen-Age—F. C. **Burkitt** Notes on Genesis in the latin Vulgate—D. **De Bruyne** Cassiodore et l'Amiatinus—Comptes rendus.

Revue Biblique, July 1927 (Vol. xxxvi, No. 3: Librairie Lecoffre, Paris). M.-J. **Lagrange** La gnose mandéenne et la tradition évangélique —P. **Cruveilhier** Le droit de la femme dans la Genèse et dans le recueil de lois assyriennes—Mélanges—Chronique—Recensions.

Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, July 1927 (Vol. xxiii, No. 3: 40 rue de Namur, Louvain). P. **Galtier** Le véritable édit de Calliste—G. **Mollat** Épisodes du siège du palais des papes au temps de Benoît XIII—M. **Dubruel** Les Congrégations des affaires de France sous Innocent XI —D. **De Bruyne** Notes sur les lettres de saint Augustin—**Gr. Peradsé** L'activité littéraire des moines géorgiens au monastère d'Iviron, au mont Athos—Comptes rendus.

(4) German.

Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, N. F. ix (Vol. xlvi, No. 2: L. Klotz, Gotha). P. **Kalkoff** Die Stellung des deutschen Humanisten zur Reformation—P. M. **Baumgarten** Bemerkungen zu v. Pastors Papstgeschichte—H. **Petri** Zur Familiengeschichte des Coelio Secundo Curione—E. **Kochs** Das Kriegsproblem in der spiritualistischen Gesamtsanschauung Christian Hohburgs—E. **Eylenstein** Carl Brockhaus.

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1928

NOTES AND STUDIES

PROLEGOMENA TO THE *TESTIMONIA* AND *AD FORTUNATUM* OF ST CYPRIAN.[1]

III

THE PRINTED TEXT AND PRINCIPAL MSS OF ST CYPIARN.

i. *The edition of Hartel.*

FOR the purposes of these notes no more than one edition need be taken into account: it will suffice to enumerate the older editions at the foot of the page.[2] That does not in the least mean that the text given by the edition in question, that of W. von Hartel in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* iii, 1871, is better than the texts given in the older editions: in many respects, especially in the Biblical citations of which the *Testimonia* and *ad Fortunatum* mainly consist, it is definitely worse. But it is the only edition with any modern critical apparatus, the only edition of portable size, the only edition with even relatively complete information about the MSS: and it is in consequence the indispensable starting-point of further enquiry.

---

[1] The two previous instalments of these *Prolegomena* appeared as long ago as January 1905 (*J. T. S.* vi 246–270) and October 1907 (ix 62–87). They bore the title Prolegomena to the *Testimonia* only of St Cyprian: but I have now added the name of the other book which is also made up, if not quite so exclusively as the *Testimonia*, of Biblical citations, the *ad Fortunatum de exhortatione martyrii*. I had never given up the hope of editing the *Testimonia*, for which Dr Sanday's Seminar on the Western text had begun, quite thirty years ago, to collect material. But the immediate impetus for a continuation of these studies was given by my appointment in 1925 to be Grinfield Lecturer on the LXX at Oxford, for I took as the subject of the last four of my six terminal lectures St Cyprian's text of the LXX. The present instalment is an expansion and recasting of the lecture given in Trinity Term 1926.

[2] The following is a rough list of the principal editions between 1471 and 1726—no work of importance was done on St Cyprian's text between 1726 and the appearance of Hartel's edition, a century and a half later. I have marked with an asterisk those of which copies are in my possession. *Editio princeps*, Rome, Sweynheym and Pannartz, 1471: *Venice, Vindelinus Spirensis, 1471: [Cologne, according to Brunet], A. Kunne de Duderstadt Memmingensis *s. l. et a.* [circa 1477]: [Deventer], R. Paffroet, *s. l. et a.* [circa 1477]: *Venice, Lucas Venetus, 1483: Paris, Jehan Petit, 1500: *Paris, B. Rembolt, 1512: *Basle, Froben, 1520. This last, the edition of Erasmus, went through several editions. Then come *Rome, Paulus Manutius, 1563—for Latini's connexion with it see p. 117: Paris, 1564, edited by Morel: *Antwerp, 1568, edited by Pamelius, and often reprinted (my copy is of Paris, 1574): *Paris, 1648, edited by Rigalt (my edition bears the date 1666): *Oxford, 1682, edited by bishop Fell, with 'Annales Cyprianici' by bishop Pearson—to this edition we owe the present order of the Epistles of St Cyprian: *Paris, 1726, edited by Baluze and published after his death by dom Maran.

Hartel inspected far more manuscripts than any of his predecessors, and we owe to him the first attempt to describe them and estimate their value and group them into families.[1] Unfortunately he never for any of the treatises constructed his apparatus out of more than five MSS: unfortunately, also, both in the *Testimonia* and in the *ad Fortunatum* he paid undue deference to a single MS, because in each case it happened to be the oldest, A of the *Testimonia* (Sessorianus LVIII, now Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele 2106) and S of the (greater part of the) *ad Fortunatum* (Seguierianus, Paris 10592).[2]

That A gives a recension of the *Testimonia*, adapted throughout to a later Biblical text, was perhaps suspected by Hartel himself (p. xxv), was demonstrated from a consideration of the evidence of the codex Bobiensis (*k*) of the Gospels by Dr Sanday in 1886 (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts* II xlvi–lxvii), and is now universally admitted: cf. Hans von Soden's *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Africa zur Zeit Cyprian's*, 1909 (Texte und Untersuchungen vol. xxxiii), pp. 33 ff. By a happy chance Hartel had himself provided in his apparatus the antidote to his own text, for he had in his own library of Vienna (Vindob. 962) a Lorsch MS L, whose unique excellence in the *Testimonia* is now as much a common-place in Cyprianic criticism as the comparative worthlessness of A.

S is the oldest of all extant MSS of Cyprian, but it is Gallic, and few general rules are more sound than that, of pre-Carolingian MSS, those copied in Italy are better than those copied in Gaul. So when Hartel writes (p. v) 'hunc optimum librum ducem ita adhibui, ut nisi ratio repugnaret aut manifestis ille inquinaretur mendis, contra reliquos libros omnes huius scripturas in textum reciperem', suspicion is at once aroused. And suspicion is more than justified. Sanday could still say (*op. cit.* p. xliv) of S, 'the leading authority for the text of Cyprian wherever it is extant': but von Soden (*op. cit.* p. 41) already saw that in the Biblical citations of *ad Fort.* it was demonstrably inferior to the other MSS whose readings are recorded side by side with it in Hartel's apparatus.

---

[1] Manuscripts altogether unknown to him are X O U and Angers 148 (see the description of these MSS, below, pp. 127–130), none of them later than the tenth century, while of V (Veronensis) his knowledge was very defective.

[2] It may be as well here to give the caution that an older MS, however depraved its text, may be of supreme value in its orthography. Both A and S are illustrations of this, and if Hartel had followed their spellings his text would have been signally improved. He has in fact followed them where their guidance misled him and neglected them just where they could have put him right.

But the drawbacks of Hartel's edition do not end here. No scholar who has had experience in collating MSS, and combining the collations into an apparatus, and passing the apparatus through the press, will pass severe judgement on occasional error. But after re-collating A and L for the *Testimonia* and S for *ad Fort.*, I feel entitled to say that, after all allowances are made, the proportion of errors is considerably greater than it ought to have been.

Some such result might have been expected by any one who took the trouble to test the edition in those respects where testing is available for all of us, namely, in the Biblical references attached to the text and in the index of Biblical passages contained on pp. 327–372 of vol. iii: it may be noted in passing that the index does not extend to forty-six pages but to sixteen, for pp. 337–366 are non-existent, and (a more serious blunder) that all the references for the two sheets pp. 273–304 of vol. i, *de dominica oratione* § 10–*de mortalitate* § 12, are entirely omitted from the index. I have added in an appendix to this paper a revised index to St Cyprian's citations from the Octateuch and historical books of O. T., as a specimen of what needs to be done to bring his edition up to the proper standard: and I proceed to catalogue here such errors and omissions as I have noted in Hartel's apparatus of Biblical references as given at the foot of the page in his edition of the *Testimonia* and of the *ad Fortunatum*.

In the *Testimonia*:

39. 11. no reference] it should be Iud. 10. 6.
40. 11. Nehem. 9. 26] add = 2 Esdr. 19. 26.
44. 14. Matt. 23. 37 sq] read Luc. 13. 34, 35; the readings 'gallina' without a verb, 'noluistis' (LPQRVX), 'domus uestra' without 'deserta' (L* P V X) shew by comparison with *e* that Cyprian is quoting Luke not Matthew.
49. 15 and 17. Matt. 24. 2, Marc. 14. 58] read Marc. 13. 2; it is all one quotation, and the connecting 'et' is part of the quotation.
52. 1. Hosea 2. 25, 1. 10] read Rom. 9. 25, 26, for Cypr. is quoting Hosea through St Paul: von Soden has not noticed this. Read dilectam *bis* with A L P V R Q T U X.
53. 1, 4, 15, 17–19, 21] add cf. Gen. 29. 17, 1 Reg. 1. 2, Tobit 12. 15 (ℵ text), Zach. 4. 10, 3. 9, Prov. 9. 1.

65. 7. Apoc. 19. 11 et 19] read Apoc. 19. 11 et 13.
83. 7, 8, 13, 17, 20, 25] add cf. Gen. 28. 11–13, 18, 1 Cor. 11. 3, Exod. 17. 10, 12, 1 Reg. 6. 14, 17. 49, 7. 12 (84. 1, 2 is a verbal citation of 1 Reg. 7. 12).
85. 14. Hier. 16. 9] read Hier. 7. 34.
86. 9. *in lege*] cf. Ruth 4. 7, 8.
92. 8 (it should be 92. 10). Matt. 16. 4] read Matt. 12. 39, 40.
94. 18. 1 Io. 2. 32] read 1 Io. 2. 23.
109. 23. Prov. 16. 6] add (= 15. 27).
121. 10. Ps. 117. 6 sq] read 121. 10 Ps. 117. 6; 121. 11 Ps. 117. 8, 9.
130. 13. Apoc. 6. 7 sq] read Apoc. 6. 9–11.
131. 14. Apoc. 2. 10 et 16. 5] read Apoc. 2. 10 et 16. 15.
134. 5. no reference] supply Sirac. 1. 14 (16).
141. 7. Matt. 3. 10] perhaps rather Matt. 7. 19.
144. 4. Hier. 48. 10] add (= 31. 10).
151. 2. Abac. 2. 4] read 151. 1 Abac. 2. 4; 151. 2 (for 'in Daniele' read 'in Machabaeis' with A L P T U X) 1 Macc. 2. 59.
154. 22. Deut. 30, 19] read Deut. 30. 15, 19.
155. 14. Es. 3. 9] read Es. 5. 21.
157. 16 (it should be 157. 17). Matt. 5. 26] add = Luc. 12. 59 (cf. *e*).
162. 19. Hier. 28. 15–18] read Hier. 10. 12–15.
166. 6, 8] add cf. Gen. 24. 2, 4; 2 Esdr. 10. 3 or 1 Esdr. 8. 90, 9. 36.
170. 8. 1 Cor. 3. 18 sq] read 1 Cor. 3. 18–20, and in l. 11 'et iterum' (for 'item illic') with L P R T U V W and Gr. καὶ πάλιν.
173. 6. 1 Reg. 11. 23] read perhaps 3 Reg. 11. 14 (*v.* 23 is absent from cod. B of LXX: *v.* 14 is in both A and B).
    15. Deut. 18. 10] read (with the lemma of 173. 12 'In Leuitico') Lev. 19. 26.
    17. Lev. 19. 26, 27] read 173. 17 Lev. 19. 27 *a*; 173. 19 Lev. 19. 27 *b*.
174. 9. Ps. 13. 21] read Ps. 132. 1.
178. 17. Io. 2. 16 = Matt. 21. 13] omit the equation to Matt. For the omission of the negative see Sabatier *ad loc.*
180. 7. Deut. 32. 35] read (with the lemma 'apud Solomonem in Parhoemiis') Prov. 20. 12 (22).
    9. Rom. 12. 19] but the lemma 'Item alibi' suggests that Cypr. is quoting O.T. through St Paul but does not know the exact source of the 'scripture'. In fact it is Deut. 32. 35 according to the Hebrew, but not according to LXX.

In the *ad Fortunatum*:

322. 23. Deut. 6. 13] read Matt. 4. 10 = Luc. 4. 8. 'Scriptum est' is part of the quotation.

322. 24. Exod. 20. 3] read (with the lemma 'In Deuteronomio') Deut. 5. 7 according to codd. A F of the LXX.

323. 11. Marc. 12. 29, 12 Matt. 22. 37 sq] Hartel is wrong in separating two quotations, for the 'et' of l. 12 is part of the Biblical text. It is probable that the quotation is wholly Marcan.

326. 5] add cf. 1 Macc. 2. 24.

337. 6] add cf. Matt. 23. 35.

338. 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 17, 25] add Tobit 12. 15 (א text); Apoc. 1. 12; Prov. 9. 1; 1 Reg. 2. 5; Is. 4. 1; Matt. 16. 18; 2 Macc. 7. 1, 3, 4.

341. 20–342. 3] add 2 Macc. 6. 18 sqq.

ii. *The principal* MSS *containing the* Testimonia *and the* ad Fortunatum.

(1) V. Of this MS there is more to say than of any other, not merely on account of its antiquity, in which it probably surpassed all other MSS that here concern us, with the possible exception of S, but because it is now lost, and its text and characteristics have to be painfully restored from a minute examination of the use made of it in the sixteenth century before it mysteriously disappeared.

As its name Veronensis implies, it was the property of the Chapter Library of Verona; and as all the evidence suggests that it was very ancient, there is some presumption that it belonged, like most of the other ancient MSS of the church of Verona, to the sixth century.[1] In the middle of the sixteenth century the illustrious scholar Latino Latini made extensive use of it, as will appear farther on. But not long after that, the Chapter presented the MS to San Carlo Borromeo, the great archbishop of Milan[2]: and from then onwards all trace of it is lost.

Latini's collation of V was originally made for the purpose of Manutius's edition of 1563, and was largely employed in the construction of its text. But the edition contained none of the critical notes which Latini had prepared, and so he would not permit his name to be mentioned anywhere, whether on the title-page or in the preface. Our detailed knowledge of the readings of V as recorded by Latini was acquired from other sources, primarily from his *Obseruationes* published by C. Magri *Bibliotheca sacra et profana* 1677—and from a series of *Variae Lectiones* recorded in a copy of the Manutian edition. It is ultimately from this latter source that more recent editors, Rigalt, Fell, Baluze, and Hartel himself, have derived their knowledge of V. But the information is defective: and that is the only possible excuse for Hartel's unfavourable judgement of V: *in crisi nihil valet.*

---

[1] They are for the most part in semi-uncial writing: so apparently was V (Mercati [see p. 119 below], p. 5 n. 5).

[2] It was already his property, it would seem, in 1561, when Manutius published his *Orthographia*: for under the word *culcita* Manutius cites its authority and mentions that it was now by the gift of the Canons in the library of the illustrious 'Cardinal Charles Borromaeus, sister's son of Pope Pius IV'. San Carlo became archbishop in 1560 and died in 1584. The MS would naturally have passed into the Ambrosiana at Milan, founded by San Carlo's nephew and successor: but it is probable that it never got as far as Milan at all.

Now, however, owing to the researches of Mgr G. Mercati, the present prefect of the Vatican Library, we are placed in a very different position, for he has discovered two copies of different editions of St Cyprian, each containing autograph collations of V. In the Brancacci collection at Naples, now incorporated in the library of the University, is preserved (under the press-mark 4 A. 38) a copy of the Gryphius edition of 1537 belonging to Latino Latini, containing the whole apparatus criticus collected by him for the edition of Manutius: the MS date attached to his list of symbols, 16 April 1559, presumably represents the date at which the apparatus was commenced. The symbol V here signifies the Veronensis. Further, in the Chapter Library at Viterbo (under the press-mark N 149) is a copy of the Roman edition (i.e. Manutius) of 1563, also belonging to Latini, also containing *inter alia* a collation of V, in this case under the symbol *Ver.* Many readings of V are here attested which do not appear in the Brancacci Gryphius, for the simple reason that they were the readings of the Gryphius text. Between the two collations we have, in Mercati's judgement, a fairly precise record of the readings of the Verona MS. [There is also in the Vatican a copy of the Gryphius edition of 1535, the property of a friend of Latini's, J. B. Bandini, the notes in which Mercati originally thought to be in Latini's handwriting: but the notes are not free from errors in so far as they refer to extant MSS and it is therefore satisfactory to learn that he is now convinced that the hand is Bandini's own, see p. 136.]

It must be some thirty years ago or nearly that Dr Mercati made for Dr Sanday an exhaustive collation, with Hartel's edition of the *Testimonia* and *ad Fortunatum*, of all the variant readings explicitly attested by Latini himself, marking the Brancacci variants in red ink, the Bandini variants in violet ink, and the Viterbo variants in blue pencil: he suggested that, when our edition should appear, the three sources should be distinguished, where distinction is necessary, as V^b, V^d, V^v. The volume is now in my possession, and I am glad to have the opportunity of making the fact publicly known, should I never be able to produce the edition of the two treatises which was planned by Dr Sanday a generation ago.

Obviously then we have now at disposal a far more exact knowledge of V than was possible to Hartel, and his unfavourable verdict is, on our new material, open to revision.

Towards that revision Dr Mercati made a notable contribution in his important treatise *D'alcuni nuovi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano*, published at Rome as long ago as 1899. He there based his high estimate of V on three capital facts:

(i) The completeness of the collection of genuine Cyprianic writings, and the simple and intelligible order of their arrangement: treatises, letters to the confessors and martyrs, letters to the clergy and people of Carthage, letters to Rome, letters to African bishops with the letters on the Rebaptism controversy, miscellaneous letters: and finally a few letters addressed to Cyprian in answer to letters from him.

(ii) The accurate preservation of the African numeration of the Psalms. Just as the ordinary Greek and Latin numeration is lower by one, from Psalms x to cxlvi, than that in the Hebrew (and English) texts, so the African Bible numbered Psalms ii to (at least) cxi by one cipher less than did the corresponding Greek and (apart from Africa) Latin texts. V preserves this exceptional feature more faithfully than any extant MS.[1]

(iii) The *Sententiae Episcoporum* preserved in many of our MSS give us the votes of Cyprian and eighty-six other African bishops at the Rebaptism Council of A.D. 256. In V (and in lesser measure in the related but inferior MS C, Paris. 12126) most of the bishops' names are equipped with one or other of the titles *Confessor* (twenty-four), *Martyr* (four), *Confessor et Martyr* (seven), *Martyr et de schismaticis* (one: no. 70), *In pace* (thirty-three). That leaves only some thirteen unaccounted for: one here and there may have lost his title by accident, but the natural presumption is that most of this remainder were still living when the titles were added to the list. At the most not more than one bishop in six survived, and the series of notes may therefore have been drawn up some twenty-five or thirty years after the event. We should be quite safe in saying that the details must have been collected somewhere in the last twenty years of the third century. And they can have been collected nowhere but in Africa.

We find then at this point in V definite traces of an African editor of the end of the third century. With that conclusion the other *data* entirely agree. The peculiar numeration of the Psalms was characteristically African at any rate after A.D. 300: in the fourth century Lactantius and Optatus shew traces of it; European writers do not. The systematic arrangement of the Cyprianic writings in V betrays the conscious work of an editor: the completeness of the collection and the absence of spurious elements argues an editor working under the most favourable conditions, that is to say, in Africa and probably in Carthage.

---

[1] See *J.T.S.* vi 264 (Jan. 1905), where I repeated Dr Mercati's list with the addition of the testimony of four or five additional MSS. Of these the Oxford MS O and the Manchester MS X (see below, pp. 128, 129) are, next to V, the most faithful to the primitive numeration: both of them surpass L.

But if V is no haphazard aggregation of smaller collections and disparate material, but represents the work of a single editor, early in date and unusually well equipped in his circumstances, it will, just because it descends from a consciously made edition, be liable to certain dangers that affect its text. An editor, whether of the New Testament writings or of the writings of St Cyprian, very likely got rid of a good many corrupt readings that were beginning to disfigure the text of his author, but he was almost sure, at some point or another, to subject the text to rules or principles or idiosyncrasies of his own. V is no exception to this truth, and perhaps it is its Biblical text that has suffered most. At a later point in our enquiry it will be shewn that in certain cases, where Cyprian's text of the Bible shews differences as between the *Testimonia* and the *ad Fortunatum*, V has assimilated either the one to the other or one of them to a text of its own. But if the latter explanation be correct, it is at least certain that V's Bible text was very near indeed in general type to that of Cyprian. It is African, and of a date not far removed from Cyprian's own.

All this entirely harmonizes with the presumptions suggested by Dr Mercati's arguments. So far from being, as Hartel supposes, a degenerate descendant of his second group (p. li), V presents us with a very early African edition of St Cyprian's collected works. That by reason of its editorial element it occasionally offers a text inferior to that of the best among the other MSS is a striking testimony to the faithful transmission of an author whose writings ranked in the West, at the close of the age of persecutions, as second only to the Scriptures themselves.

(2) R, cod. Vat. Reg. 116, saec. ix: before it came into the hands of queen Christina, the property of Peter Daniel of Orleans, and perhaps therefore a Fleury book; at any rate Gallic of the Carolingian age. I mention it at this point, in the first place because it belongs definitely to the V family, in the second place because I attribute to its text a very much greater value than does Hartel. Probably it is a good way inferior to V, but in view of the lacunae of our knowledge of V its evidence is always worth considering, and it is possible that it may sometimes represent the tradition of the V family better than V itself. As illustrating the contribution which V R or V or R can offer to the improvement of Hartel's text, I cite from Hartel's apparatus the following readings in *ep.* 4 (Hartel pp. 472. 9–478. 7):

473. 2 statum suum continenter et firmiter tenere: *read* in statu suo esse (instituisse R) et continentiam firmiter tenere V R.

473. 8 nostris: non R, *shewing that it was copied from an ancient MS which gave* ·N̄· *for* nostris (*cf.* 474. 4 zabulo).

13 instruit: *read* admonet et instruit R (*cf.* admoneat et instruat L).

474. 11 conscientia grauissima cohaeserunt: glutino conscientiae cohaeserint R, *cf.* 231. 9 concordiae glutino copulata.

15 pudicae et castae sine ulla fabula perseuerent, ita fortes ... expectent: pudicae et castae et sine ulla fabula perseuerent, et fortes ... expectent V (R). *Cf.* 201. 16.

475. 8 per zeli dolorem: per zeli liuorem V R, *cf. the treatise* De zelo et liuore.

476. 5–9 si autem de eis aliqua corrupta fuerit deprehensa, agat paenitentiam ... ad ecclesiam redeat: *read plural all through with* R, *and so all MSS in the next sentence,* 9–14.

14 quicumque fecerit superbiam: quicumque fecerit in superbia R *with the Greek, and so Cyprian elsewhere* (469. 18, 596. 17, etc.).

18 agit: agent R, *and so Cyprian* 469. 21, 670. 23, 728. 19.

19 iudicii sui tempus constituit non oboedientibus: iudicibus a se ad tempus constitutis non oboedientes R (*with support from* L Q). *The idea of future judgement is quite alien from the passage.*

477. 2 circumcisio spiritalis esse ad fideles seruos Dei: apud *for* ad V R.

2, 3 spiritali gladio superbi et contumaces necantur, dum de ecclesia eiciuntur: *insert* sic *before* superbi R (*with* Q).

12 arta et angusta est uia per quam ingredimur ad uitam: gradimur *for* ingredimur V R, *cf.* 202. 9–12 arta et angusta est uia ... per hunc uiae limitem ... iusti quique gradiuntur. *You 'enter' by a gate: but along a 'road' you 'walk'.*

15 nec sacerdotes Dei * * aut per ecclesiam scandalo se et fratribus offerant *Hartel, conjecturing* 'offendant *uel tale quid*' *where he has marked a lacuna*: nec sacerdotes Dei aut [ad R (V ?)] ecclesiam scandalo suae prauitatis offendant R V, *making excellent sense.*

18 ergo ego inimicus factus sum uerum praedicans uobis: ergo inimicus uobis factus sum uerum dicens uobis R. *It is possible that* ego *after* ergo *is wrongly omitted by* R W: *it is certain that* R Q *are right in inserting* uobis *after* inimicus.

19 quod si obtemperauerint, nobis gratissimum est; stantes eos ad salutem dignatione nostri sermonis firmauimus: quod

si obtemperauerint nobis [uobis *wrongly* R W*], lucrati sumus fratres et eos ad salutem pariter et dignationem nostro sermone firmauimus R *with some support from* L. *This is, of all the cases quoted, the most brilliant testimony to the excellence of* R. *The allusion to* Matt. xviii 15 *is clear, while* dignatio 'is not used of human action' *in Cyprian* (*Watson* Style and Language of St Cyprian *p.* 248), *and* R *is the only MS here which refers it to God, connecting it with* salus—salus *as Christians,* dignatio *as virgins.*

478. 2 secundum eundem apostolum dicentem *Hartel, with no construction to the sentence*: sequamur eundem apostolum dicentem R.

It is all but incredible that an editor should have printed so depraved a text as Hartel has given us of this epistle, with the testimony of R staring him in the face at the foot of the page. The only explanation that can be given is that he was obsessed by the conviction that a MS related to V could not conceivably preserve the true text against all or nearly all of the rest. That his conviction in this respect was radically unsound the evidence just accumulated is sufficient to demonstrate.

(3) L, cod. Vindobonensis 962, saec. ix: inscribed with the name of the monastery of Lorsch in the Palatinate, and presumably acquired by the Imperial library as part of the spoils of the Thirty Years' War. It contains only the *Testimonia* and a number of the Epistles: and since by a fortunate chance there is extant a tenth-century catalogue of the Lorsch Library, we see that L is one of a pair of MSS of St Cyprian, the sister volume, now lost, having contained eleven treatises and *ep.* 58. It is perhaps worth while to cite the description of the lost MS from G. Becker *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (1885) p. 107: 'Caecilii Cypriani epistolae numero XII in uno codice: I ad Donatum. II de disciplina et habitu virginum. III de lapsis. IV de catholicae ecclesiae unitate. V de bono patientiae. VI de zelo et livore. VII de dominica oratione. VIII de mortalitate. IX ad Demetrianum. X de opere et eleemosynis. XI ad Fortunatum. XII ad Tiburtinum.

We cannot assume that the text of L was as valuable in these treatises as it is in the *Testimonia*. But for the *Testimonia* it (or its family) is beyond question the best witness, and that conclusion is now so universally accepted that it may be assumed here without argument. Only the caution should be given *in limine* that there is one qualification to be made in this general estimate, namely, that the orthography of L is notably inferior to the rest of its text. MSS of the Carolingian age are often copied with the most scrupulous fidelity in other respects, but not uncommonly they do assimilate any archaic spelling of their exemplars to the standard accepted in their own time. L is an illustration of this rule: its orthography is notably inferior, if our object is to restore the Old-Latin Bible text as used by St Cyprian, to the orthography of A.

Long ago Dr Sanday procured photographs of the text of L for the whole three books of the *Testimonia*, and one set of these has been all along in my possession. From it I re-collated the MS with the printed text and apparatus of Hartel, and I reproduce here the more important corrections which can thus be effected in his record of the readings of L (I have not included spellings, unless they contribute to the improvement of Hartel's text, or are of special interest).

36. 15 legenti H. legentibus L. L *has* legenti tibi.
37. 1, 2 LIBER PRIMVS. CAPITVLA. *om.* L: *the only title is as given on p.* 35, *notes l.* 3.
3 dominum. dom̄ L (*so, as H. notes,* 56. 11 *for* domino).
38. 8 quot: quod A M. L *also has* quod. *So too* 52. 5.
39. 4 eis: ei L L *has* eis.
10 quae circa illos sunt: *om.* sunt A. L P *also omit* sunt.
40. 4 ambulare: ampulare L^1. *I see no trace of this.*
5 eos: *om.* M. L P *also omit.*
18 agnouit. L* adgnouit.
41. 20 domini: L *in ras.* L* dnm̄.
42. 3 quotquot: quodquod L^2. L* quodquod.
12 in illa die. *om.* in L* (*not* P).
16 quoad discant. L *divides the words* quo addiscant.
17 item: *om.* M B L P *also omit.*
43. 2 conuersus est. L conuersus es (P conuersi *without* es).
44. 10 custodia: custodiarium L M B. L^2 *has* custodi*arium in ras., though the correction is m p.*
cucumerario: cucumeraria L V. L *has* cuccumeraria.
12 sicut A: quasi L M B. L (*with* P) *has, what Hartel does not make clear,* quasi *for* sicut *twice in the line.*
noluisti: non uoluistis L noluistis B V. *But* L (*with* P) *has quite clearly* noluistis, *though there are two dots over* -is, *as over* remittetur, *which may indicate doubt in the mind of some later scribe.*
17 deserta: *om.* B V. *But the* deserta *of* L, *though by an early hand, is not by the original hand: the mark of a stop after* uestra *is clearly discernible.* P *too omits, so that the evidence of the* L P *family is beyond doubt for omission.*
45. 1 uenientem: ueniens M V. *But* uenientem *is clearly* L^2, *not* L*, *which apparently gave* uenies. P *has* ueniens, *so that again the testimony of the* L P *family is clear.*

45. 16 ad iesum: *post* iesum *eras.* ue *in* L. *But* L* *had* ad iesu naue, *from the previous line, corrected by the first hand to* ad iesum.

46. 1 illud. L* P* illum.
feminis: seminis L L P *have* feminis.
6 dices: dicet L L P *have* dices.
11 iudicabit. L* iudicauit, *and similarly in l.* 14: *not* P.
14 in gentes: *probably a misprint for* inter gentes, *the reading of* A L P etc

47. 15 in euangelio. L* in euangelium.
16 Iohannes: Iohannis A L B. L P Iohannes *with text.*
18 calciamenta: calceamenta L M B. L calciamenta *with text.*

48. 3 quare: ad quid L. aut quid L* ad quid L^2 P (*rightly*).
9 discite: scitote L. *Hartel does not make it clear that* L (*with* P) *omits* a me.
19 eas. *Probably a misprint for* eos, *which is read by* A L P *and is demanded by the sense.*
pascent: pascant L. L *has* pascent.
22 cum disciplina: cum disciplinam L. cum disciplina L^2 (*there is nothing to shew whether the correction is by the first hand or no*) P.

49. 16 dissoluatur: dissoluetur L. L dissoluatur.
22 adipem: pinguamina W L M B. L pinguamini (P pinguamina).

50. 12 *add* et sacrificium acceptum non habebo ex manibus uestris L. acceptum, *however, is added above the line by* L^2: P *omits the whole with the other MSS.*
15 genui: generaui V. generaui L P.

51. 17 speratis. L *gives* sperastis *with Gr.* ἠλπίκατε.

52. 10 fige palos: et fige L^1 effige L^2. *There is no suggestion of* effige *in* L *even by m.* 2.

54. 12 filii. fili L*.
13 benedictus erit: erit benedictus W M B. erit benedictus *also* L P.
22 tuae: *om.* L. L *has* tuae.

55. 6 lauabit: lauauit M*. lauauit *also* L*.

56. 3, 4 item illic . . . confugient. L (*not however* P) *omits this quotation.*

57. 4 inuocauit: uocauit A. L P uocauit.

Some of these errors (though by no means all of them) are of sufficient importance to affect our decision as to the text: at any rate, they justify the printing of the list of them for Book I, though space forbids a similar treatment of Books II and III.

(4) P, cod. Paris. lat. 1647 A, of the ninth century. Of the same family as L, but independent of it, and therefore valuable as often enabling us to distinguish what are just individual errors in L and not the readings of the archetype of the family. There are also occasional omissions (by homoeoteleuton ?) of whole quotations, e. g. 50. 1–4, in L, not shared by P, where P enables us to restore the readings of the family for several lines on end. Where we have both at command, they are in complete agreement for nineteen variations (I should say) among the MSS out of every twenty. Where they differ, it is generally because one or other of them has made some ordinary scribal blunder. But one gets the impression that there is a residuum of cases where L is the more archaic of the two: it preserves perhaps the archaic numeration of the Psalms rather oftener than P (41. 19 ·XXV· L P: 42. 1 ·LXXX· L P: 48. 3 ·I· L P: 50. 1 ·XLVIII· wrongly L P: 50. 6 ·IIII· wrongly L P: 50. 15 ·CVIII· L, ·CVIIII· P: 55. 13 ·XVI· L P: 58. 2 ·XXXIII· wrongly L P: in the second book P has the lower number against L in 65. 1, L* against P perhaps in 69. 18, 72. 8, 73. 5, L certainly in 85. 2), but there is not much to choose, and L² changes the right to the wrong number not infrequently. I have collated P throughout the *Testimonia*: its ancestor was defective from 87. 19 to 101. 19.[1]

(5) Quir. = Brescia, biblioteca Quiriniana H VI 11, fifth century. Three uncial leaves, guard-leaves to the MS with the above press-mark, were discovered by Mgr Giovanni Mercati in 1894, and were described and examined in his book already named, *D' alcuni nuovi sussidi per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano* (1899) pp. 1–4, 44–67 (transcription on pp. 49–54). A fragment so ancient would be of entrancing interest in any case: what we have in it is surprising almost beyond belief, for, as it happens, seven out of the twelve columns present part of the long interpolation, Hartel 134. 15–138. 21, which so far had been known to us on no ancient authority save that of Hartel's W. It is none the less an interpolation because it is now shewn to go back to at least the fifth century, just as the interpolation of passages from 2 Maccabees by V R, Hartel 132. 11–26, is none the less an interpolation from the *ad Fortunatum* because Mercati has shewn that the recension represented by V goes back to the third century itself.

---

[1] Of a third MS of this family, N, cod. Cassinensis 204, I hope to be able some day to record the evidence through the kind offices of Abbot Ramsay of Downside, who possesses a collation of it. Abbot Ramsay (like Prof. E. W. Watson of Christ Church) for many years contemplated an edition of St Cyprian: but his duties, first as head master of the school and now as abbot of the monastery, have left him but scanty leisure. Nevertheless, in spite of the passing of the years, I have not given up the hope that something may still be forthcoming from his pen.

What we have then in Quir. is the same recension of the *Testimonia* as in W, but in a much purer and more ancient form. Some allowance, however, as always in Hartel, must be made for errors in the apparatus criticus: and in fact of the five readings cited by Dr Mercati on p. 60 to illustrate the depravation of the text between Quir. and W, one, the omission of 'et in corda illorum' in 135. 4, is an error not of W but of Baluze's text (cited by Hartel as *v*), one is an entire blunder of Hartel's, for in 137. 18 W has 'accepto faciet' with Quir. (not 'accepto fauet'), and one a partial blunder, 135. 7 'propitius', where W reads not as Hartel reports it, 'proprius', but what is one step nearer to the true text, 'propius'.[1]

In the other five columns of Quir. we have matter corresponding to Hartel 132. 4 (omitting of course 132. 11–26)–134. 14. Quir. gives a very good text, as good indeed as any MS but L. Its differences from L (or rather from L P) are the following: (i) 132. 5 in lege Quir. A W B: in uia L P V? R^2 X, in uiis M. (ii) 132. 5 scrutantur Quir.: persecrutantur L *cett.* (iii) 132. 8 praemium resurrectionis Quir. benev.: *om.* resurrectionis L *cett.* (iv) 132. 10 claritatem dei Quir.: *om.* dei L *cett.* (v) 133. 7 in epistula pauli Quir. W M B X: in epistulis pauli L P^2 T U. (vi) 133. 8 ab agapen Quir.: ab agape L P V R T U X, a caritate A W M B. (vii) 133. 9 angustia Quir. A W M B: angustiae L P U R T X^2. (viii) 133. 9 famis Quir. A W: fames L *cett.* (ix) 133. 14 descendi Quir. *cett.*: discendi L A. (x) 133. 20 dicit mihi Quir. M T V ? X: mihi dicit L *cett.* (xi) 133. 22 in regno Quir. R*: in regnum L *cett.* (xii) 133. 23 facit uoluntatem Quir.: paruerit uoluntati L *cett.* (xiii) 134. 4 principium Quir. benev. O: initium L *cett.* (xiv) 134. 4 domini Quir. A W M U: dei L P B V R. (xv) 134. 5 solomonis Quir. A: salomonis L *cett.* (xvi) 134. 5 timor domini (cf. timore W, dominum M X) Quir.: timere deum V, metuere deum L *cett.* (xvii) 134. 6 reueretur Quir. benev.: ueretur L *cett.*, metuit A. (xviii) 134. 7 eseian: esaian R, esaiam L *cett.*

In spellings like (viii) famis, and (xv) solomonis, Quir. may well be right, but I do not think that any of its unique readings have any claim to be regarded as genuine. What is, however, really important is that in three striking cases, (iii) (xiii) (xvii), Quir. agrees with the Beneventan

---

[1] I had a morning's work at Würzburg in August 1927 at a MS of Councils: and my travelling companion, Mr J. G. Beevor of New College, Oxford, was good enough to collate for me on the same occasion Hartel's W of St Cyprian for the section 134. 15–138. 21. Besides the two readings mentioned in the text, the following additions or corrections should be made: 135. 1 W does not omit non: 135. 1 eos for eorum W: 135. 6 me scient me (not me scient) W: 135. 20 omni 1° is by the first hand of W: 136. 8 CXLIIII] + milia W: 136. 14 manifestate W*: 136. 24 miliagnorum W: 137. 20 fructus W: 137. 20 ueris W* uentris W^2: 137. 22 ut ut facias: 137. 24 in the citation from Habakkuk auditum tuum (not auditu tuum) W with Quir.: 138. 6 quomo W: 138. 16 iussus (not iusus) W.

MS (*b*) against the rest. Clearly their common stock represents an early Italian edition of the fourth or fifth century.

(6) Q and M. M is a Munich MS, collated by Hartel, of the ninth century: Q, Troyes 581, is a sister MS superior in age, saec. viii–ix, and rather distinctly superior in text. The corrections of Q^2 are neither very early nor very good. I have collated it as far as the end of the fifth chapter of the third book, the MS having been, by the kindness of the French authorities, transferred to Paris for my use.

I record the divergences of Q from M throughout the whole of Book I: 38. 21 reliquerint Q. 39. 8 fili isrl malignum coram dominum deum Q. 39. 9 deos gentium Q. 39. 12 contra dominum Q. 39. 19 item quod Q. 40. 2 a uia sua maligna Q. 40. 6 ad disperdendum uos Q. 40. 11 hesdra Q. 40. 16 (42. 9) eseian Q. 40. 19 meus (*pro* me 2^o) Q. 41. 1 fili Q. 41. 3 intellegitis Q. 41. 4 ingrassauit Q. 41. 14 dicetis Q. 42. 2 iohannen Q. 42. 3 et: *om.* Q. 42. 4 eum: autem Q. 42. 15 danielum Q. 42. 16 quo discant Q. 43. 2 conuersus est Q 43. 5 adinpleri Q. 43. 8 tertio Q. 43. 16 ambacuc Q. 43. 19 est: *om.* Q^*. 44. 8 exustae Q. 44. 9 alienigenae Q. 44. 9 desertam Q. 44. 10 cucumeraria Q. 44. 13 similaremus Q. 44. 16 noluistis Q. 45. 4 fili Q. 45. 19 expoliationem Q. 46. 14 inter gentes Q. 46. 19 ueniunt Q. 48. 8 honerati Q. 48. 10 animis Q. 48. 21 dominus dicit: *om.* Q. 49. 5 domum Q. 49. 12 aedificauit Q. 49. 12 in nomine Q. 50. 6 ·IIII· Q. 50. 15 dominus Q. 50. 16 paenitebitur Q. 50. 17 helian Q. 51. 6 audire Q. 51. 14 haec Q. 51. 21 nobis: nouis Q. 51. 24 osee Q. 52. 2 non: *om.* Q. 52. 7 (*et* 16) sterilis Q. 52. 9 delata Q. 52. 10 et noli parcere Q. 53. 5 fennanam Q. 53. 11 fili Q. 54. 7–13: *habet* Q. 54. 8 isaac et Q. 54. 12 fili Q. 54. 14 uidit autem Q. 55. 2 mihi fili Q. 55. 8 lacte Q. 55. 13 et: *om.* Q. 55. 14 non noui Q. 55. 15 de hoc ipso Q. 56. 7 uiam maris Q. 56. 13 non cludentur Q^*: non concludentur Q^2. 57. 4 inuocabit Q. 57. 15 iocundabuntur Q. 58. 3 uir est qui Q. 58. 3 in eum Q. 58. 6 iohannen Q. 59. 5 relaxabo Q.

Every now and then M has a better spelling: every now and then Q has some small blunder of its own. But on the whole it is clear that Q is the better representative of the family.

(7) X. We pass now to a series of MSS not known to Hartel, three of them preserved in English libraries, one in France: and of these four the earliest and probably the most important is a MS now in the

Rylands Library at Manchester, which we have called X. It was written in the eighth century, probably at Murbach in Alsace, to which monastery it certainly belonged in the fifteenth century (Traube *Palaeographische Forschungen* iii [1904] 335): it bore the number 298 in the 1859 sale catalogue of Libri MSS. Libri bought it at the sale in 1858 of the Maimbourg MSS at Colmar.[1]

By the kindness of Dr E. W. Watson I copied his collation of *Test.* many years ago, and was also able to inspect the MS at Manchester in October 1906. I am also enabled to print here his list of its contents; so far as I am aware, no such list has so far been published. It seems obvious that, just as with L', we have in it the second of a pair of MSS of which the first must have contained the treatises other than the *Testimonia* and the *Quod Idola*.

Epp. 39, 67, 10, 69 part ii; *Test.* I, II, III; *Epp.* 63, 6, 55, 28, 37, 11, 38, 76, 73, 71, 70; *Sententiae Episcoporum*; *Epp.* 3, 74, 69 part i, 64, 2, 72, 12, 32, 20, 13, 43, 65, 52, 1, 56, 3 (repeated), 47, 45, 44, 61, 46, 40, 4, 57, 59, 48, 51, 54, 60; *Quod Idola*.

The text of all these documents, whether letters or treatises, is complete, save for *ep.* 69 §§ 1*b*–6, pp. 749. 13 quominus ipse–755. 16 et maiorem, and *ep.* 74 §§ 8–10, pp. 806. 10 crinibus pullulantes–807. 17 discendi patientiam. It is, however, possible that the order at the commencement of the MS is not original, and that the four letters which precede *Test.* and between them make up two complete gatherings may have got to their present position by some mistake, so that *Test.* would have had the first place in the MS.[2] It is perhaps in favour of this view that a good deal is illegible in the early part of *Test.* i.

If we apply to X the criterion on which Mercati relies to shew the special excellence, namely, the traces of the antique 'African' numeration of the Psalms (*D' alcuni sussidi* p. 20), we find that X comes midway V and the rest: while V has the old numbering 73 times, X follows suit with 50 or 51, while Hartel's five MSS of the *Testimonia* range from the 22 of L to the 4 of A. In fairness, however, to L P, it should be said that if we revise Mercati's figures by including (1) readings of L* neglected by Hartel, and (2) readings of P where P gives the lower Psalm number though L does not, the total for the family rises from 22 to 37. But X still remains, as far as this test is concerned, decidedly the most faithful witness, after V, to the Cyprianic tradition.

In Books I and II of the *Testimonia* the chapters are numbered with Greek numerals, but in Book III with Latin. Perhaps the courage of the scribe gave way under the prospect of deciphering the higher numbers in the unfamiliar script.

---

[1] For a second Cyprian MS in the same Libri catalogue, no. 299, see no. (8) below.

[2] I cannot now find anything in my notes which would clear up this point.

As one would expect, X is subject to the ordinary disadvantages of an eighth-century MS written before the new standard of Carolingian scholarship had reformed the business of scribes. In comparison for instance with L, it is clumsy and ignorant, and its minor delinquencies if recorded in full would need a large measure of room in any apparatus. But apart from blunders its substantial text is a very good one, not far removed from the L type, and in just those matters where unreformed texts are better than reformed ones its superiority to L is clear. Thus it gives the right reading 'cata Lucanum' in every single case where the Third Gospel is quoted by name. Its age entitles it to collation throughout: but an unsupported reading of X is no more likely to be genuine than it would be in any other Merovingian MS of an ancient author.

(8) O, Bodl. Add. C 15, was curiously enough also purchased at the same Libri sale of 1859: it is in fact the no. 299 referred to on p. 128 n. 1, only it is there attributed to the ninth century, while Dr Sanday, who was the first in recent times to call attention to the need for further examination of the Oxford MSS of Cyprian (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts* II [1886], appendix ii, pp. 122 ff), writes 'ascribed to the early part of the tenth century', so that ix–x will not be far out. It had apparently belonged earlier in the nineteenth century to a Monsieur H. Chauffour of Colmar: and Libri seems to have bought it at the same sale as the MS last described, X.

Of O (Sanday's O_1) I have, in a volume that came on to me from Dr Sanday, a collation of the third book only of the *Testimonia*, I am not sure by whom. Its text appears to be of high interest: in 134. 4 it gives 'Principium' for 'Initium' with Quir. Benev. and in the next line 'timor domini' with Quir.: while the explicit of the *de unitate* is 'Caecili Cypriani de ecclesiae unitate' (without 'catholicae'), a correct and unusual reading.

The contents are the treatises (including *Quod Idola*, all three books of *Testimonia*, and *Sent. Epp.*) and a few of the longer epistles, 63, 58, 76, 58 (again and with an independent text), 55, 66, 30, 2, 64.

(9) U, Bodl. Laud. 105, Sanday's O_3; 'ascribed to the end of the eleventh century', but it is in fact rather of the first half of the tenth. This is the one Oxford MS which I have myself collated in full for the *Testimonia*, partly I suppose because I seemed to trace a relationship to L (compare, e.g., the following: 175. 4 ad] apud L U: 177. 6 pessimae] pessime L U: 182. 2 perimam] peremam L U: 183. 5 spiritalia] spiritalis L U: in all four cases P has the ordinary reading), partly because no collation of it had been made for Dr Sanday.

U has extraordinarily few abbreviations: practically none except the *Nomina Sacra*, and the final ‾ at the end of a line. The spellings are sometimes very ancient, e. g. 40. 5 manum for manuum, 49. 20 quid, 64. 17 eructua(b)it; the Greek numerals are retained throughout for the chapter headings. U would seem, in fact, to have been copied direct from a primitive exemplar.

(10) Andegavensis (Angers) 148 [140], perhaps of the late ninth century. I have of this MS photographs of foll. 176 *a*–190 *a*, containing *Test.* i and *Test.* ii as far as almost the end of chapter 13 (Hartel 79. 8). But I have nothing as yet to say about its text.

I return now to the two oldest extant MSS, Hartel's A of the *Testimonia*, and S of *ad Fortunatum*: and with some fresh details about these two MSS I will bring to an end this section of Prolegomena.

(11) A. The MS was written in the eighth century, probably, as I should judge, in the first half of the century. With the other Sessorian MSS it was annexed by the Italian government in 1880, and transferred to the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele, where it now bears the number 2106: like other old Sessorian MSS, it had been brought to Rome from the monastery of Nonantola in northern Italy, not far from Bologna. On foll. 1 *a*–154 *b* it contains the *Speculum* of pseudo-Augustine (in Weihrich's edition in *C. S. E. L.* it is cited as S), on foll. 154 *b*–225 the *Testimonia*, which commences on the same page as the *Speculum* ends. The whole MS is made up of twenty-nine quaternions (many of them, however, consisting of seven leaves only) and one ternion, foll. 107–112; of which the first fifteen, foll. 1–112, are signed with numbers i–xv, the other fifteen with letters of the alphabet, a to o, the last signature being lost owing to the mutilation of the last two leaves. The writing is uncial, by more than one hand, but the same hand which concludes the *Speculum* also commences the *Testimonia*.

There are corrections by the first hand (or a diorthota); there is also a second hand, itself early, but very easily distinguishable from A*, and of no value. There are not many abbreviations beyond the Sacred Names, and per, pro, prae, and $\overline{\text{qm}}$ = quoniam, and $\overline{\text{eung}}$, or similar forms, for euangelio. There are occasional ligatures: 160. 22 Hartel has misunderstood the ligature -en- in 'argentum' as -om-. A cursive r is occasionally employed to save space: 174. 5 Hartel has wrongly given secedit for recedit as the reading of A.

I re-collated A in May 1903, and found Hartel's work fairly accurate save in the one respect in which A had its best title to respect, namely, in its orthography. He ought indeed to have put in his text many spellings of A which he has duly noted in his apparatus, e. g. profeta, Istrahel, Mattheus (all three *passim*), Danihelum 84. 5, 121. 13, Or 89. 17: but much ought also to have appeared there on the authority of A which he has not recorded at all, e. g. Bahal 39. 12; Samuhel 53. 9, 84. 1; Mannasse 54. 17; Isac 58. 16, 87. 1; Oseae 69. 15, 92. 6; blasfemat 71. 9; Betlem 77. 4, 8; facinorosos 80. 16; heremo 88. 17; Aron 89. 17; orfanorum 95. 18; eructuauit 97. 16; diabulo 100. 16.[1]

(12) S. Paris 10592, of the sixth century, does not contain the *Testimonia* and even of the *ad Fortunatum* its text is not complete, for it begins only near the end of chapter 4 (Hartel 325. 4). About the contents of the MS I wrote a brief paper in the JOURNAL many years ago,[2] and I will not repeat what I said, as it has no direct bearing on our present purpose. But, as with A, it is important to warn students that Hartel has neglected its evidence just where it would have helped him most. Abbreviations indeed of the *Nomina Sacra* it might be hardly fair to expect any scholar to have recorded, before Traube emphasized their special value: S has consistently dm̄s dm̄i dm̄o, in 325. 6 the accusative dom̄, and in 343. 11 apparently sps̄ sn̄c for spiritus sanctus. Inquid and euuangelio appear consistently. Of proper names he should have noted Amalec 330. 23, 331. 3, 6; Aron 331. 1; Moysei 331. 2; Balam (Alam S*, but the correction is by the first hand) 334. 1; and in 325. 22 S has idolatrian, not idolatriam. More important are 326. 16 in caelis est S with R; 330. 12 fili in both places S; 333. 21 mugilatum, not mogilalum, S; 335. 13 sunt *om.* S as well as W R; 336. 9 S* has porte‾|ta, S^2 portenta; 339. 28 habes for habens S; 340. 4 martyrii (wrongly of course), not martyri, S; 341. 1 feliciorem S; 341. 19 occansione, not occansionem, S; 341. 23 S has (for se illa) suella, that is, suilla 'swine's flesh', a very interesting reading whether or no it is correct; 341. 25 nobilitates and fingeret S; 342. 13 *om.* et S; 343. 21 persequentium nos adque in | sequentium nos adque in|festantium S*, just repeating one line by *homoeoarcton*; 344. 19 metunt S; 345. 1 persecutiones S; 345. 15 aut fratres *om.* S; 345. 26 fide S; 346. 26 meditationis S; 347. 3 anchristus S.

Enough has been said to shew the imperative need for the supersession of Hartel by a better edition: enough perhaps also to shew that the hope is not an irrational one of restoring, with the use of all the means at disposal, something like the *ipsissima verba* of large portions of St Cyprian's Bible.

---

[1] I have not pursued this select catalogue of omissions beyond the first two Books.

[2] *J. T. S.* iii (Jan. 1902) pp. 282–285.

APPENDIX I

Revised list of Biblical references in St Cyprian, from Genesis to the end of the Historical Books of O. T., for Hartel's edition

In Genesi

i	26	198. 10
iii	14, 15	74. 9
	16	144. 13: 202. 28
	17–19	158. 3: 405. 1
v	24	158. 11: 311. 17
xii	1–3	54. 2
xiv	18	703. 3
xv	6	43. 17: 150. 13
xix	24	146. 15
xxii	1, 2	127. 19
	11–13	67. 7: 134. 9
xxv	23	51. 22
xxvii	27–29	54. 7
xxxi	13	67. 12
xxxv	1	68. 11
xxxvii	19, 20	734. 11
xlviii	17–19	54. 13
xlix	(8–10) 11	705. (2), 7
	8–12	54. 21

In Exodo

i	12	332. 23
iii	2	179. 12
	2–6	86. 19
iv	11, 12	333. 21
xii	3, 5–11	80. 23
	6	714. 16
	11	122. 14
	13	90. 13: 367. 11
	46	174. 7: 217. 11: 752. 22
xiii	21	67. 14
xiv	11 *b*, 12 *b*, 13, 14	328. 12
	19	67. 16
xvii	9–14	89. 12
	11–14	330. 21
xix	10, 11	92. 5
	15	146. 3
	18	179. 4
	22	723. 10: 736. 1: 777. 5
xx	4	161. 7: 322. 12
	7	126. 1
	12	793. 13
	23	161. 6
xxii	20 (19)	242. 24: 323. 22: 362. 10: 680. 1: 722. 12
	22–24 (21–23)	181. 23
	27	126. 4
xxiii	7	80. 3
	20, 21	67. 18
xxviii	39 (43)	723. 12: 736. 3: 777. 7
xxxii	1	38. 22
	6	164. 4
	31, 32	39. 2: 250. 24: 324. 13

In Leuitico

vii	10 (20)	176. 10: 248. 9
xi	44 (xix 2, xx 7: cf. 1 Pet. i 16)	275. 1: 769. 8
xix	13, 26, 27 *a*, 27 *b*, 32	173. 12, 15, 17, 19, 174. 2
	27 *b*	259. 10
xxi	17 (cf. 18, 21)	723. 8: 736. 6: 777. 3
xxiv	13, 14	126. 7

In Numeris

viii	5–7 *a*	761. 22
xii	3 *a*	635. 12

xvi 26 *b*	737. 17 : 758. 5
40 *a* (xvii 5 *a*)	757. 12
xvii 10 *b* (25 *b*)	127. 11 : 303. 21
xix 9 *b*	762. 3
11 *b*, 12, 13 *b*	761. 16
22 *a*	768. 2
xx 25, 26	738. 6
xxiii 19 *a*	88. 15
24 *a*	55. 9
xxiv 7–9	74. 19
17 *b*	74. 18
xxv 10–13	cf. 785. 13, 14

In Deuteronomio

v 7	322. 24 : 355. 1
vi 5	133. 2
13 (cf. Matt. iv 10)	121. 22 : 241. 26 : 354. 26.
15	785. 11
viii 2	304. 1
xiii 3 *b* (4 *b*)	127. 22 : 304. 4 : 331. 9
5 *a* (6 *a*)	594. 19
6, 8–10 *a* (7–11 *a*)	325. 11
12, 13 *b*, 15 *a*, 16 *b*, 17 *b*, 18 *a* (13–19 *a*)	325. 22
xvii 12 *a*	596. 17
12 *a*, 13	469. 18 : 476. 14 : 670. 19 : 728. 15
xviii 17 *a*, 18, 19	51. 8
xxiii 19 *a* (20 *a*)	153. 16
21, 23 (22, 24)	143. 17
xxiv 16	646. 1
xxv 9	cf. 86. 9
xxvii 8	82. 16
xxviii 44	55. 10
66	87. 19
xxx 6 *a*	45. 14
15, 19 *b*	154. 22
xxxii 17 *a*	39. 6 : 323. 23
39	322. 25
xxxiii 9	272. 23 : 327. 13 : 386. 2

Apud Iesu Naue

i 8	800. 11
ii 18, 19	217. 5 : 753. 1
v 2	45. 16
13–15	86. 11
xxiv 26, 27	82. 17

In libro Iudicum

ii 11–13	39. 7
x 6	39. 11

In basilion [·I·]

i 13	269. 17
ii 3	117. 2
4	117. 4
5	53. 10
25	142. 14 : 325. 5
30	274. 17 : 429. 18
35, 36	50. 18
vii 12	84. 1
viii 7	470. 12 : 670. 24 : 728. 20
xvi 7	157. 2 : 257. 9
xxi 4	146. 4

In basilion [·II·]

vii 4, 5, 12–14 *a*, 16	49. 7 : 75. 20

In basilion [·III·]

xi 4 (3)	167. 2
14 (23)	173. 6 : 286. 13
31, 32, 36 *b*	216. 3
xvii 14	386. 27
[xviii 21	452. 2]
xix 10	40. 7

In basilion [·IIII·]

xvii 20, 21	754. 20

In paralipomenon

II Chron. xv 2	142. 4 : 329. 7
xxiv 20	687. 8

In Hesdra (apud Hesdram)

I Esdr. iv 38–40	807. 2
II Esdr. xix 26 (= Neh. ix 26)	40. 11

In Tobia (apud Tobiam)

ii 2	109. 4
14	119. 21 : 303. 1
iv 5–11 (B text)	109. 8 : 389. 4
12 (B text)	166. 4
xii 8	290. 17
8, 9	377. 11
11–15 (א text)	291. 1 : 303. 6 (cf. 53. 14, 338. 2)
xiii 6 (B text)	337. 23
xiv 9 (א text)	388. 27

In Machabeis

I Macc. ii 52	128. 9
59	151. 2
60	155. 15
62, 63	117. 7 : 669. 3
II Macc. vi 30	342. 6 [132. 11]
vii 9	339. 12 [132. 15]
14	339. 21 [132. 17]
16, 17	339. 28 [132. 20]
18 *b*, 19	340. 12 [132. 23]
27–29	341. 2
ix 12 *b*	117. 6

APPENDIX II

Dr Mercati's account of his method in regard to the readings of the lost MSS Ver(onensis) *and* b(eneventanus)

Quanto a Ver. e b(enevent.), mi sono sforzato di darne non solo le lezioni trascritte, ma approssimativamente l' intero testo collazionato da Latini, affinchè i Colleghi conoscano di per sè quale variante e quale forma di vocabolo è esplicitamente attestata, e quale invece è soltanto supponibile e probabile fosse nei perduti codici Veronese e Beneventano. Per questo

1°] ho collazionato di nuovo coll' Hartel l' ed. Erasm. dell' a. 1521, come nel 1897 collazionai la Grifiana o Lionese del 1537. Quante volte l' Erasm. è uguale a *v* dell' Hartel, ho posto una lineetta sotto il *v*. Quante volte invece la lezione dell' Erasmiana è diversa, ho segnato *e* la lezione dell' Erasmiana. Ciò era necessario premettere, affinchè si sapesse quale era o quale era supponibile fosse la lezione di *b* V, allorchè il Latini non segnò alcuna discordia o variante.

Se non che (*a*) purtroppo m' accorsi che l' Erasm. del 1521 e la Lionese del 1537 non sono identiche affatto (cp. pp. 65. 3, 70. 17 etc.), e che l' Erasmiana forse è stata ritoccata, e la Lionese invece non dipende da quella Erasm. del 1521. Inoltre (*b*) se certamente Lat. Latini collazionò il Veron. coll' ed. del 1537, non sono sicuro che l' Agostini collazionasse il Neapol. colla stessa ovvero con altra edizione.

Tanto che il grado di probabilità per la supposta lezione del Benev. forse non è uguale di quello che ha la supposta lezione del Veron.

Io ho notato le differenze fra l' Erasm. e la Grif. dove me ne sono accorto. Fare un intero confronto delle due ed. fra loro nè il tempo nè l' animo m' hanno concesso.

2°] ho copiato tutte le varie lezioni esplicitamente attestate da L. Latini stesso, traendole

(*a*) dall' esemplare della Grifiana a. 1537, tutto postillato di mano di Latino e ora conservato nell' Universitaria di Napoli nel vecchio fondo Brancacciano. Le lezioni fornite da questo esemplare (che sono le più numerose e si potrebbero segnare V^b) sono riprodotte in inchiostro *rosso*. Quante volte Lat. segnò solo la lettera o sillaba variante, io ho usato l' inchiostro nero per le lettere rimanenti: così ho usato l' inchiostro nero per le parole precedenti o seguenti ad una lezione esplicitamente attestata.

(*b*) dall' ed. Grif. a. 1535, già appartenuta a Ioh. Bapt. Bandini, amico del Latini, e ora conservata nella Riserva della Biblioteca Vaticana. Sembra anch' essa postillata da Latini: ma nei libri *ad Quirin.* e *ad Fortun.* presenta poche varianti, che ho designato con inchiostro *violetto*. Tra questo e il precedente esemplare non v' è sempre concordia. E. g. esso presenta qualche lezione in più, ovvero più precisa, di V (V^d), 49. 12 (?), 66. 6 (erron.), 76. 1, 77. 20, 88. 13, 96. 2 (?), 96. 12, 96. 16, 117. 8 (?), 132. 4, 324. 16; di N, ossia *b*, 59. 13, 64. 17, 77. 20, 86. 20, 115. 13; di P, 64. 21, 179. 1 (ma tutte e due sbagliate, come ho potuto vedere sul cod. stesso). Inoltre viene data anche ad N una lezione di V, pp. 56. 11, 57. 15, 79. 9, 156. 8: e viceversa p. 79. 21, cfr. anche 56. 6. Alle volte dà a N V lezioni che non corrispondono esattamente a nessuno dei due: cfr. 52. 10, 75. 1, 111. 1. Così che conviene andar cauti nell' uso di questa copia: nella quale si badò forse più alla sostanza e al tenore generale della lezione, anzichè alla forma precisa.

(*c*) dall' ed. rom. a. 1563, già di proprietà *Latini Latinii Viterbiens.* e ora conservata nella Biblioteca Capitolare di Viterbo, alla segnatura N 149. Le postille sono autografe di Latini, che segnò non poche varianti da me indicate con matita (*lapis*) turchina. L' esemplare è prezioso: (i) perchè ci attesta che l' interpretazione da me data del cifrario Latiniano è esatta; e (ii) perchè ci attesta esplicitamente tante lezioni di V N, non trascritte in (*a*) perchè conformi al testo di quell' edizione grifiana. L' ordine delle sigle è qui come in (*b*), cioè *Ver. Ben.* e i *Vatic.*; mentre in (*a*) si usa *b* per N e la forma *V. C.*[1] Da questa copia si vede che L. Latini continuò a collazionare codici anche dopo

---

[1] Inoltre in (*c*) non compare P, cioè il cod. di Pietro di Damiano, se non probabilmente sotto la forma di Vat. 1.

(*a*) e l' ed. rom., giacchè a p. 1 ricorda *Vaticani septem integri non possunt inter vetustos censeri, sed non ideo tamen omnes recentes iudicandi.*

Io non so, ma credo che coll' aiuto di questi tre esemplari, e specie di (*a*) e (*c*), si può riguadagnare una cognizione abbastanza precisa di V Benev.

A designare le varianti dei tre esemplari, forse si potrebbero adottare i simboli V^b (brancacc.), V^d (bandin.), V^v (viterb.).

Naturalmente, nell' edizione deve scomparire la maggior parte di quanto ho notato io: ma però non sono pentito d' aver segnato piuttosto troppo che poco. Così, ad es., d' aver notato le lezioni di P o d' altro codice Vaticano, giacchè allora è moralmente certo che V *b* non avevano la stessa lezione; altrimenti avrebbe Latini aggiunto anche la sigla di V o B. Ho segnato pure le restituzioni di Latini in (*a*), anche quando non consta donde le pigliasse. Dapprima avevo pensato che da V, e diffatti talvolta risulta questo; cfr. p. 161. 7: ma altrove certamente no; cfr. p. 142. 23–143. 1.

Di V è a notare (i) gli spostamenti *ad Quirin.* I 21, III 33, e nei capit. del lib. III 21, 20, 98, 97; (ii) le aggiunte II 18, III 17 (cfr. *ad Fortun.* 11), 19, *ad Fortun.* 8 (p. 330. 2), etc.; (iii) le omissioni piccole di 79. 4, 90. 12, 121, 21, etc., e la caduta d' un foglio o due che conteneva circa 40 linee dell' ed. a III 26–29 (p. 141. 4–142. 23).

[NOTE. Mgr Mercati now writes, under date Jan. 18, 1928, that he has come to the conclusion that the collation in Bandini's copy of the Gryphius ed. of 1535, (b) above, is after all not Latini's but Bandini's own. 'La scrittura è davvero somigliante assai, ma avendo veduto in seguito parecchi manoscritti del Bandini e alcune edizioni di Santi Padri con simile note (varianti, citazioni, ecc.) di mano di lui mi sono persuaso che non il Latini ma il Bandini postillò la Grifiana del 1535: così le confusioni e gli errori rimangono spiegati. Il Bandini († 1628), correttore della Tipografia Vaticana antica, attese alle stampe della Volgata Clementina, dei libri liturgici usciti sotto Clemente VIII e Paolo V, dei Concilii, degli Annali del Baronio ecc., e a quelle allora preparate ma non uscite di vari Santi Padri. Interessante la corrispondenza fra lui e Francesco Lucas di Bruges pubblicata dal de Schrevel (cf. H. Höpfl *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata*, Freiburg im Br., 1913, 221 sgg.). Le carte e i libri postillati di lui furono acquistati dalla Vaticana: cf. cod. Vatic. lat. 7762, f. 54–66ʳ. Di lui ho fatto qualche cenno in *Rassegna Gregoriana* iv (1905) 256; vi (1906) 13 sgg. Parecchi documenti e notizie su lui in P. M. Baumgarten *Neue Kunde von alten Bibeln* I 136 sg., 140, 300 sgg., 320 ecc.; II 141, 50* sg.]

C. H. TURNER.

ST CUNGAR AND ST DECUMAN.

A LEAF of parchment, measuring 16½ in. by 12 in., in a handwriting of the fifteenth century, torn from a Wells breviary, has been folded and used as the cover of the Communar's Accounts of the year ending Michaelmas 1591. It contains services of three lessons for the Translation of St Andrew (9 May) and the Translation of St Thomas the Martyr (7 July); and collects for St Petroc (4 June), St Decuman (30 Aug.), with a *memoria* of St Felix and St Audactus on the same day, the Translation of St Egwin (10 Sept.), St Euphemia (16 Sept.), St Thomas of Hereford (2 Oct.), St Winifred (3 Nov.), St Cungar (27 Nov.), and a *memoria* of St Egwin (30 Dec.).

Local interest centres in St Cungar and St Decuman, each of whom has given his name to a Somerset village—Congresbury, between Yatton and Cheddar; and St Decuman's, better known as Watchet, where we fought the Danes more than once in the tenth century. Neither of these saints appears, so far as we know, in any English calendar outside the county. Of St Cungar I have written twice already in this JOURNAL,[1] and I may perhaps be allowed to plead that as an excuse in asking for its hospitality once again. With regard to what I have already said I have only this to add, that besides the three English calendars then known to contain his name, it is found in a fifteenth-century Wells calendar in the British Museum (Addit. MS. 6059), and in a thirteenth-century calendar prefixed to a breviary of Muchelney Abbey, now in the possession of Mr Meade Falkner.[2]

In my first article on St Cungar I ventured to make two criticisms on the account recently given of him by the Bollandists in the *Acta Sanctorum* under 7 November, the date assigned to him in the martyrologies. The challenge has proved unexpectedly fruitful; for Father Paul Grosjean, S.J., who has for some time been residing in Oxford and devoting special attention to Celtic hagiology, has now given us a new and exhaustive study of *St Cyngar*, as he prefers to call him, in the *Analecta Bollandiana* (xlii 100–120). I have to thank him for the courtesy with which he has accepted my suggestions, as well as for the further light which he has thrown upon the story of this cult.

---

[1] 'A Fragment of the Life of St Cungar' (xx 97 ff, January 1919); 'The Lives of St Cungar and St Gildas' (xxiii 15 ff, October 1921).

[2] This latter calendar, together with a series of monastic charters, &c., inserted in the two volumes of this breviary, will shortly be edited by Dr Schofield of the British Museum, under the title of 'Muchelney Memoranda', for the Somerset Record Society; and I have taken the opportunity of adding to it a study of the Medieval Calendars of Somerset. To this I may refer for a fuller treatment of some of the matters touched upon here.

Of St Decuman not much can be profitably said. His Life may be read in the *Nova Legenda Angliae* (Horstman, i 263 ff). It tells us that he was born of noble Christian parents in Wales; that after a virtuous youth he fled from his worldly surroundings, made himself a raft of branches from a thicket, crossed the Severn Sea, and landed near Dunster Castle. He found a wild spot, where he practised the usual austerities, and was supplied with milk on feast-days by a friendly cow, as St Giles was by his hind. A cruel pagan cut off his head; but he presently arose, took his head in his hands, and carried it to a spring, which became famous as St Decuman's Well. The Life is a late work, composed to order for his liturgical commemoration; and the writer had nothing to go upon but the story of the cow and the tradition of the well.

For information as to a church and a chapel dedicated to St Decuman in Wales it is sufficient to refer to the article upon him in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. We may add that a charter of King John on behalf of the Cistercian abbey of Neath speaks of land 'inter ecclesiam sancti Decumani et Kanesford' (*Monasticon* v 260). 'Degamanus', moreover, has a chapel at Wendron in Cornwall. The Bollandists have him under 27 Aug., where he comes in the martyrologies; but his Somerset day is 30 Aug. He occurs in the calendar of Muchelney (cent. xiii) and in the Wells colour-list (cent. xiv).

His observance at Wells was doubtless due to the fact that the church of St Decuman was given as a prebend at the end of the twelfth century. The donor was Simon Brito, and an endowment in land was added by Robert Fitzurse. These were among the knights who twenty years before had struck down Thomas à Becket in his cathedral church at Canterbury.

In commenting on the items of our present fragment it is proper to premise that the calendar in use at Wells was that of the church of Salisbury with certain local variations.

The Translation of St Andrew was not observed at Salisbury; but at Wells St Andrew is the patron of the cathedral church.

The Translation of St Thomas the Martyr was perhaps of recent observance at Wells, and so has come into what is evidently an appendix to the breviary. His name, as usual, has been obliterated.

St Petroc owes his position here doubtless to the fact that he is the patron saint of the prebendal church of Timberscombe.

Of *St Decuman* we have spoken above. A *memoria* of *St Felix and St Audactus* follows, because St Decuman has claimed the first place on their proper day.

St Egwin was bishop of Worcester in 692. In 710 he resigned his bishopric to become the first abbot of Evesham, where he had founded a monastery. He died on 30 Dec. 717. His bones were translated to a new shrine on 10 Sept. 1039. These are the two days for which collects are supplied here, and on which we find him commemorated in the Muchelney calendar. The extraordinary attention paid to St Egwin and some other Worcester saints in Somerset is hard to explain. I have discussed the matter at length in the dissertation on Somerset Calendars to which I have referred above; but, though some curiously interesting links are to be found between Wells and Evesham, the explanation is still to seek. The collect for St Egwin's Translation begins at the bottom of one column and ends at the top of the next. An inch or two has been cut away from the top of the folio, so that a line has been lost; but the missing words can be supplied from the collect for the Translation of St Cuthbert, which is almost word for word the same.

St Euphemia has the same prominence as here in the calendar of the priory of Dunster; and the explanation is to be found at Bath, of which this priory was a dependent cell. A Bath chartulary, now at Lincoln's Inn, tells us that the body of St Euphemia was given to that monastery by Bishop Reginald at the end of the twelfth century.

St Thomas of Hereford was canonized in 1310. His position here no doubt indicates that his cult was comparatively recent at Wells: it is surprising to find it there at all.

St Winifred need not detain us: her cult was still more recent. She came into the Salisbury calendar after an injunction of Roger Walden in 1398, repeated by Chichely in 1415 (*Salisbury Processions*, by Christopher Wordsworth, p. 13). She is at home at Holywell in Flintshire: her wonderful story may be read in *Nova Legenda*, ii 415 ff.

COLLECTS.

Sancti Petroci abbatis. Oracio.

Gloriosi famuli tui Petroci, domine, precibus pacem tuam nostris concede temporibus; et ecclesie tue hanc largire misericordiam, ut nullus tuis privetur beneficiis qui huius confessoris expetit opitulari suffragiis. Per dominum.

Sancti Decumani martiris. Oracio.

Deus qui es propugnaculum, fortitudo et corona innocencium, da nobis beati Decumani martiris tui et exemplis instrui et precibus adiuuari. Per dominum.

Eodem die fiat memoria de sanctis Felice et Adaucto. Or.

Maiestatem tuam, domine, suppliciter deprecamur, ut sicut ⟨nos⟩ iugiter sanctorum martirum tuorum Felicis et Adaucti commemoracione letificas, ita semper supplicacione defendas. Per dominum.

IIII°. Idus Septembris. Translacio sancti Egwyni episcopi et confessoris, memoria tantum. Or.

Presta nobis quesumus, omnipotens et misericors deus, ut qui beati Egwyni confessoris tui et pontificis transla(cionis diem ueneramur, per ipsius suffragia pie)tatis tue beneficia consequamur. Per dominum.

Sancte Eufemie virginis et martiris secundum usum Well'. Or.

Indulgenciam nobis, domine, beata Eufemia virgo et martir imploret, que tibi grata semper extitit et merito castitatis et tue professione virtutis. Per dominum.

Sancti Thome Herfordensis episcopi et confessoris. Or.

Deus qui ecclesiam tuam in beati pontificis tui Thome angelica puritate et virtutum gloria decorasti, concede nobis famulis tuis ut eius suffragantibus meritis angelorum cum ipso mereamur agminibus sociari. Per dominum.

Sancte Wenefride virginis et martiris. Oracio.

Deus qui beatam Wenefredam virginem tuam martirio consummatam mirabiliter suscitasti, et postea in presenti seculo vita diutina consecrasti: fac nobis quesumus ea interueniente vite presentis subsidia consequi pariter et futura. Per dominum.

Sancti Cungari secundum usum Well'. Or.

Deus qui beatum Cungarum fide et moribus preclarum ad regna transtulisti celestia: fac nobis ipsius suffragiis hostium nostrorum oblectamenta inoffensis gressibus transire, et per grata temporalium incrementa eterne prosperitatis premia sentire. Per.

Feria vj in natiuitate domini fiat memoria de sancto Egwyno. Or.

Sancti Egwyni confessoris tui atque pontificis, domine, nos iugiter prosequatur oracio; et quod nostra non impetrat ipso pro nobis interueniente prestetur. Per dominum.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

THE OLD-LATIN HEPTATEUCH.

The Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch, by A. V. BILLEN, D.D. (Cambridge University Press, 1927.)

OLD-LATIN Texts of the Heptateuch have hitherto been more or less neglected. There is a good deal of material, but it was for the most part fragmentary and difficult to evaluate. For a great part of the area there is only one MS extant, the Lyons Heptateuch, which contains

about three-fourths of the whole. The full text of this codex has been available since 1900, and the bad habit has grown up of regarding it as *the* 'Old-Latin', which is just about as inadequate as if in the Gospels one treated *b* (Veronensis) as representing the pre-Vulgate Latin, to the exclusion of *k* and *e* and *a* and their companions. Dr Billen in the book here noticed has for the first time brought together all the material, and put the various elements each in its proper place.

The four main surviving texts are the MSS of Lyons (*L*), of Munich (*M*) and of Würzburg (*W*), and the extensive quotations of Augustine in the Questions and Locutions on the Heptateuch. *M* and *W* are both palimpsests: the former was edited by L. Ziegler in 1883, the latter by E. Ranke in 1871. *M* contains about 1,000 verses from Exod., Lev., Num., and Deut.; *W* about 360 from all the Pentateuch except Numbers. Both *M* and *W* are of the sixth century, if not earlier: *L* is late sixth century.

M, *W*, and *L* have all three been excellently edited. What was wanted, and has been supplied by Dr Billen, was a systematic comparison of them with each other and Patristic quotations. This is not so easy as might at first sight appear. The extant fragments often do not overlap, and where they do it is for the most part in the less quoted parts of the Pentateuch, where moreover the vocabulary is so technical as not readily to be compared with the more familiar vocabulary of the Gospels or the Psalms. There is also this further difficulty, that it is likely that the translation of the whole Pentateuch or Heptateuch was undertaken somewhat later than the more immediately edifying portions of Holy Writ, perhaps therefore by translators different from those of the Gospels or the Psalms or Isaiah, perhaps therefore having somewhat different preferences in the choice of renderings. It cannot be too clearly remembered that some of the things we label 'african' or 'european' are not differences of dialect, but a choice of synonyms made by certain translators. The use of *illic* for *ibi* may indeed be a true 'african-Latin' peculiarity; but the choice, e. g., of *claritas* to render δόξα instead of *gloria* or *honor* is a translator's choice, and we must be prepared to find that the 'african' preference for *claritas* in St Matthew may not hold for St John, still less for such-and-such a group of Old Testament books.

It is Dr Billen's great merit that he has found a method for characterizing the texts of *L*, *M*, and *W*. It is, in a word, to study their vocabularies as wholes, and then to compare, not single passages with single passages (for this can but rarely be done), but vocabulary with vocabulary. Dr Billen has worked out his results with the greatest care and thoroughness. He has shewn at the very beginning (p. 7 ff) that *L* itself is not homogeneous in text, and the same is true even more strikingly of *M* (p. 23). Perhaps the most useful service a reviewer can render will be to give Dr Billen's main results in a succinct form, and then test them by a few examples.

L is mainly 'european', occupying roughly the sort of position that *b* does in the Gospels. It is not homogeneous in character, but agrees with Augustine in having a more 'african' vocabulary in Lev. and Num. than in the other books. Thus both *L* and Aug. have *proselytus* in Lev. and Num. but *aduena* in Deut.; other coincidences almost equally striking are given by Dr Billen on p. 18, though the two texts are by no means identical.

M is the most interesting of the texts: Dr Billen divides it into three sections of different textual character. The greater part of the surviving fragments (M^1), comprising Exod. xxxi–end, all Leviticus, and Deut. xxii–end, is almost pure 'african', i. e. akin to Cyprian's quotations. A second division (M^2) comprises Numbers and Deut. viii–x: this is a mixed text, less 'african' than M^1, but specially characterized by the fact that it agrees very closely with the corresponding parts of *L*. This is all the more remarkable, as it has already been established from internal character and by comparison with Augustine that the text of *L* in Num. is more 'african' than in Deut.: nevertheless the agreement with M^2 in both Num. and the early part of Deut. is well marked. The third division (M^3) consists of the earlier parts of Exodus (ix–xx), in which the text is mostly European.

Thus *M* has a mixed text, like *c* of the Gospels, which is 'european' in Matt., 'mixed' with Vulgate in Jn., and largely 'african' in Mk. and Lk. And in view of the very natural preponderance of 'european' elements in our MSS of the Gospels I think we ought rather to congratulate ourselves that the 'african' elements in *M* are so extensive than to be disappointed at the mixed character of its text.

W appears to be fairly uniform in character, occupying a position between *M* and *W*. 'In all places where *W* and *M* are both extant *M* has the more primitive text, while generally *W* is not so late as *L*' (Billen, p. 35). It may therefore be compared roughly to *a* in the Gospels.

In every way Dr Billen's book may be warmly commended to the little band of students who still interest themselves in textual criticism, and further a word should be said upon the attractive way in which the Cambridge University Press have printed it. The Index of Noteworthy Words (pp. 185–222) is a model of clearness without waste of space. I will conclude by a couple of examples, one linguistic, the other textual, which will serve both to illustrate and test Dr Billen's conclusions.

One of the few omissions I find in the book is a discussion of *secus*, or rather one should say of the Latin renderings of παρὰ with accusative.[1] The main point in such a discussion is that whereas 'african' texts in the Gospels have for 'by the way-side' (παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν) *ad uiam*, *iuxta uiam*, or sometimes *circa uiam*, the 'european' texts, including the quotations of Ambrose, have the non-classical *secus uiam*. Roughly speaking, the presence of the preposition *secus* in a text marks it as non-african and not earlier than the 4th century.

Secus = παρά occurs in *L* Exod. ii 5 (not *v.* 3), xxix 12, xl 29 (26); Lev. i 16; Num. vi 13, 18, xvi 18 (not *vv.* 19, 27); Deut. ii 8 (not *v.* 36), iii 12. This is 9 times in all, out of a possible 37. *Secus* occurs in *W* Exod. xl 29 (26), in agreement with *L*, i. e. once out of a possible 8. In M^1 (i. e. Exod. xxxi–end, Leviticus, late Deut.) *secus* does not occur at all: in Exod. xl 6 it has *secundum* (and so probably in xl 29), while in Lev. iv 4, 14 it has *ad* (with *L*). In M^2 (i. e. Numbers) *secus* = παρά does not occur, but it has *circa* in xxxiii 9, 50, *iuxta* in xxxv 1, and *ab* (!) in xxxiii 49: in all four places *L* agrees with M^2, a very striking illustration of the similarity of these texts.

On the other hand in M^3 we find *secus deserta loca* for παρὰ τὴν ἔρημον in Exod. xiii 20.

Secus does occur once in M^2, but it renders κατά not παρά, a usage found elsewhere, e. g. in the Latin Clement § 20 (p. 21, l. 7) and in the very ancient MS of the Assumption of Moses. The passage is Num. xxxiv 15, and here also *L* agrees with M^2.

Thus a consideration of the use or avoidance of *secus* in our MSS confirms Dr Billen in his analysis of the text of *M*.

It may be asked whether these intricate investigations have any tangible result, whether anything of any general interest is suggested or proved by labelling parts of an almost illegible palimpsest 'unrevised' or 'african'. Let us therefore look and see whether the older parts of *M* bring out anything that is new.

The actual disposition of the sacred objects in the Tabernacle is a matter of some interest. The arrangements are described at length in Exodus xxv ff., but technical descriptions of this kind are particularly liable to scribal errors, and where such errors have occurred we cannot expect our texts to be clear. Nevertheless there can be little doubt as to the main facts; the sacred objects, the Ark, the Table, &c., are described in Exod. xxv, and their position in the Tabernacle in Exod. xxvi. The Tabernacle was something like a Church with a Nave and Chancel, only the Chancel was at the West end (xxvi 22). At the East or open end was a curtain, and another, known as the Veil, shut off the Chancel (i. e. 'the Holy of Holies') from the Nave in which were the Table of Shew-bread and the Candlestick. This Veil was similar in position and function to a chancel-screen or the iconostasis of an Eastern Church: it was not in any way comparable to an altar-covering or a table-cloth. Inside the Veil was the Holy of Holies (or Chancel) in which there was nothing but the Ark, on the top of which was laid a golden slab called the 'Mercy Seat' or 'Propitiatory'.[1]

---

[1] See *J. T. S.* ix 297–300.

All this is to be found in any Bible Dictionary under the word 'Tabernacle', but Commentaries on Exodus are not everywhere quite so clear. The ultimate cause of this is that in Hebrew the word for 'veil' (פָּרֹכֶת *pārōkheth*) is very much like the word for 'propitiatory' (כַּפֹּרֶת *kappōreth*); in one or two places they have been confused, with the result that 'on' the Ark is placed not the sacred portable golden slab but a veil, which inevitably suggests a sort of altar-cloth. Thus in Exod. xxvi 34, where the Hebrew has 'thou shalt put the mercy-seat upon the ark', the LXX is *κατακαλύψεισ τῷ καταπετάσματι τὴν κιβωτόν*. This does suggest something of the nature of an altar-cloth, though the previous verse has explained that the Veil divides the whole Chancel from the Nave. Yet here Dr McNeile ('*Westminster Commentaries*' *Exodus*, p. 173) most unaccountably considers פרכת 'veil' preferable to כפרת 'mercy-seat'.

In the last chapter of Exodus we have the account of the actual inauguration of the Tabernacle. In Exod. xl 3 we are surprised to find no mention at all of the most sacred 'mercy-seat' or 'propitiatory': instead of this we read 'and thou shalt make the veil a covering over the ark'.[2] The Revised Version has 'thou shalt screen the ark with the veil', but that is an interpretation rather than a literal translation. Here the Samaritan text comes to our aid: instead of פרכת (veil) it reads כפרת 'propitiatory'. This is exactly what is wanted, for what was 'over' the ark was the propitiatory, not the veil. But against accepting this palmary emendation was the fact that the texts of the LXX, though here very confused, all have *τῷ καταπετάσματι*: there is nothing about a *ἱλαστήριον*.

That the texts of the LXX here are confused is attested by the fact that Exod. xl 3 is one of the few verses where the Cambridge Editors have deserted B and constructed an emended text for themselves. *L* and *W* are also extant. They have respectively

> *L—et ponis arcam testimonii et coperies arcam de uelamine.*
> *W—et pones arcam testamenti et coperies de uelamine.*

---

[1] Connected with this slab were the golden Cherubs. In Solomon's Temple (1 Kings vi 27) they seem to have been fixed objects under which the moveable Ark was put: in the Tabernacle they were obliged to be portable, so they rest *on* the Ark instead of forming a niche overshadowing the Ark.

[2] וסכת על הארן את הפרכת. For the construction see Exod. xxxiii 22: the usual construction with סכך is to have no direct accusative, as in 1 Kings viii 7.

When however we turn to *M* we find

Et pones arcam testamenti et super eam propitiatorium,

followed by 'and thou shalt bring in the Table' (*ver.* 4). Thus *L* and *W* agree with the extant Greek texts of the LXX in supporting the פרכת of the Masoretic Hebrew text, while *M* agrees with the Samaritan in supporting כפרת. The variation obviously arose in a Hebrew text not in a Greek or Latin one, and it seems to me impossible to resist the conclusion that here not only is the Samaritan right and the present Hebrew wrong, but also that *M* here preserves, and preserves alone, the true original 'Septuagint' and that all the other extant texts, including *L* and *W* and also codex B, have been revised to agree with the present Hebrew.[1] It is, I may remark in passing, a merit in B that in this verse it should be so faulty as to be unsuitable as a basis for the various readings of the other MSS, for it is as if a lying witness should whisper 'Do not trust me, I have had a false word put in my mouth here'.

It will be noticed that there is no verb in *M* corresponding to *σκεπάσεισ* (וסכת). I incline to think this omission is part of the style of translation, like *eam* instead of 'ark': there is in *M* a certain impatience all through these chapters with the leisurely style of the Priestly Code. It was probably the presence of the verb 'cover' instead of 'put' (as in Exod. xxv 21, xxvi 34) that caused the corruption of כפרת into פרכת.

It may be remarked also that in xl 19 (Heb. *ver.* 21) the *propitiatorium* appears in *M* and in the Hebrew, though it is absent from all other LXX authorities, including *L* and *W*. The wording of *M*—here much mutilated—does not agree verbally with the present Hebrew, so that *M* cannot have got its text from a Hexaplar source. In any case the decisive letters P . . . . . . | RIUM, i. e. *propitiato*rium, are visible.

The furniture of the Tabernacle and its disposition may be regarded by some as a matter of indifference. But I venture to think that the details of the transmission of Exod. xl 3 in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin do force upon us the conclusion that in this instance—and who knows in how many others?—all our LXX authorities except one branch of the Old-Latin have suffered revision from the Masoretic Hebrew. This conclusion, if accepted, is important. It shews us how little textual weight the LXX has when it agrees with the existing Hebrew, while at the same time it brings into due prominence the unique value of the ancient Latin documents in the elucidation of which Dr Billen has worked so patiently and so successfully.

---

[1] I brought forward this variation as an instance of the particular value of the text of *M* in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1903), col. 5023, note 2. In that note delete 'and the Jer. Targ.', for the 'propitiatory' is only found in a printed ed. of that Targum, not in the only extant MS (which is now known to have פרוכתא).

F. C. Burkitt.

THE TEXT OF EXODUS XL 17–19 IN THE MUNICH PALIMPSEST.

The Munich Palimpsest, called Mon. by Dr Billen and here *M*, is a sixth-century Latin uncial, with two columns to the page. When turned into a palimpsest the page was cut down so that about one-half of every alternate column is missing. There should be from 15 to 19 letters in a line, rarely more in Exod. xl, and any reconstruction should aim at an average of 17. Ziegler, who deciphered the MS so admirably, was not equally careful in his reconstructions of the missing half-lines, and he tends to suggest supplements that are too long. In counting, each letter, even 'M', counts one, but two 'I's' only count as one letter.

I here print my reconstruction of Exod. xl 17–19, giving Ziegler's (= Z) in the notes. Emended lines are marked with a *.

Ziegler, p. 29, col. *b*, ll. 6–25.

TUITCOLUMN_AS_[17]_ETEXTE-_
DITAULEAIN_TABERNACU_
LO ETINPOS_UITUELU-_
TABERNACU_LIDESUPER_ *
10 SECUNDUM_QUAEPRAE_
CEPITILLIDS
[18]ETACCEPITTES_TIMONIAETI-_ *
MISITINARC_AMETSUBMI_
SITGESTATO_RIASUBANSO_
15 LASARCAE [19]_ETINTULITEA-_ *
INSANCTU_MSANCTO_
RUM ETI_NPOSUITSU_
PEREAMP_ROPITIATO_ *
RIUMQU_ODERATDE_ *
20 _SUP_ER *
ETDIUI_SITMOYSESINTER_ *
SANCTU_MSANCTORUM_ *
ETTAB_ERNACULUM_ *
TESTIM_ONIISICUTEI_ *
25 PRAECE_PITDMS_ *

9 *desuper*] *super illud* Z: this is too long, and *desuper* corresponds to ἐπ' αὐτὴν in *ver.* 29.

12 A very long line, but the final N, if written as indicated above, does not count.

15 *ea*$^{-}$] *arca*$^{-}$ Z, which is two letters longer. The Greek is *τὴν κιβωτόν*, but *M* is given to shortening the repetitions of the original.

16 This is a short line, but cannot be lengthened: it shews how short a line in *M* can be.

18–20 Ziegler gives no supplement to these lines. Clearly *M* did not agree verbally either with Greek or Hebrew. The supplement to l. 18 is surely certain. In ll. 19, 20 *desuper* is intended to correspond to *ἄνωθεν* (= מלמעלה). For l. 20 Ziegler reads

EMER . . . .

but I cannot think of any supplement for these letters, and am driven to suppose that he misread faded letters. The next line begins a paragraph, so that probably a good deal of l. 20 was blank.

21–23. Here also Ziegler offers no supplement, but if reference be made to *M* p. 23, col. *a*, ll. 17–20, a passage where it differs widely from the Hebrew and the present Greek, we find *Et fecerunt uelum quod di|uideret inter sanctum sanc|torum et tabernaculum | testimonii* (= Exod. xxxvii 5). This suggests the supplements given above. It will be noted that on p. 23 the lines of *M* tend to be longer than on p. 29.

24 *sicut ei*] cf. *ver.* 14: *secundum quae* Z, which is too long.

25 *dms*] + *moysi* Z, but the next line begins a paragraph, so that the last third of 25 was probably blank.

It may be added that in Exod. xl 28 (34), where an equivalent for δόξησ has to be supplied, we ought to supply *honore*, not *gloria* (as Zeigler has done). *Gloria* occurs in Exod. xvi 10 (= M^3), but *honor* in Num. xii 8 (= M^2) and in Exod. xxxiii 5 (M^1).

F. C. BURKITT.

IS THE PROTO-LUKE HYPOTHESIS SOUND?

IN a recent number of this JOURNAL (April, 1927) Mr J. W. Hunkin contributed a searching criticism of Canon Streeter's Proto-Luke Hypothesis, and suggested an important modification of the hypothesis. I propose in the present article to examine the points raised, and to consider the value of the alternative suggestions, and I venture to do this because Mr Hunkin has made frequent references to my investigation of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis in *Behind the Third Gospel*.

At the outset, let me say that it is a real pleasure to find so much common ground in Mr Hunkin's account of the Lukan sources. For example, the existence of a document Q + L is frankly conceded, although Mr Hunkin prefers to think of this document rather as a collection of discourse, the discourse being sometimes attached to, or embedded in, anecdote. The estimate of the contents of Q + L also resembles Streeter's account of Proto-Luke. There are, however, important differences, of which the chief is the inclusion of the Lukan elements in the Passion narrative in the Evangelist's detached notes (L^1) rather than in Q + L. Mr Hunkin is also ready to accept Streeter's hypothesis so far as it concerns the origin of Lk. ix 51–xviii 14, 'the most considerable block of material from Q + L',[1] and, more important still, he admits that Q, worked over and improved upon by the Evangelist, enters into the final composition only through the document Q + L. The main point of difference is the question of the framework of the Third Gospel. On this matter Mr Hunkin prefers to follow the accepted theory: in his opinion, Q + L is a loosely constructed document from which material has been fitted into the Markan framework. This, in short, is the modification of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis which he proposes.

The issue thus raised is one of considerable importance. It would no doubt be a notable advance in the solution of the Synoptic problem if Q + L were proved to be such an entity as Mr Hunkin conceives it to be. But, obviously, the question whether Q + L provides the framework of the Third Gospel has historical bearings. As a collection of discourse sometimes embedded in anecdote, Q + L is one thing; as a first draft of the Gospel, supplemented later by Markan additions, it is quite another thing. The issue is the importance of Luke's 'special tradition', the form it had assumed when the Gospel was compiled, and its value as historical data.

I

Mr Hunkin justly recognizes the importance of the question of the Lukan Passion narrative, and I propose to consider this matter first. He is not prepared to grant that Lk. xxii 14–xxiv 11 is a non-Markan narrative enlarged by 'Markan extracts'; on the contrary, he holds that 'the simplest hypothesis is that St Luke deliberately corrects the Markan narrative', and claims that Mark 'seems to provide the general outline, the framework of the whole story'.

The starting-point for any discussion of the Passion narrative is the amount of verbal correspondence between Mark and Luke: we have to explain why the percentage of Markan words in the Passion narrative is only 27 while in the earlier Markan sections it is about 53. Mr Hunkin meets the difficulty by basing an argument on Lk. xxi 5–36 where the percentage of Markan words is 37. 'It must therefore be recognized', he says, 'that St Luke uses Mark with a degree of freedom which varies very considerably from time to time.' This would be a strong argument if we could be sure that Lk. xxi is Markan in origin. In *Behind the Third Gospel*, I have argued that, in verses 12–19, and 20–36, non-Markan sources have been used and expanded by the aid of Mark; and all that Mr Hunkin urges in reply is that 'the great majority of scholars will probably agree with Professor Burkitt that Mark xiii is here the only written source before St Luke'. This, I suggest; is to pursue a delicate and difficult enquiry by the method of counting heads in a case where the method may prove misleading. Nearly all the existing studies of Lk. xxi have been made by scholars who already believe that Mark is the Third Evangelist's principal source, with the result that the chapter has not received that impartial treatment manifest in Mr A. M. Perry's *Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*. I suggest that Lk. xxi still calls for examination before we can safely draw far-reaching conclusions like the one on which Mr Hunkin relies. Again, it does not seem right to base so much on the thirty-two verses of Lk. xxi 5–36, to the virtual neglect of such Markan sections as Lk. iv 31–44, v 12–vi 11, viii 4–ix 50, xviii 15–43, xx 1–xxi 4. In these passages the percentage of Markan words varies from 52 in the case of iv 31–44 to 68 in the case of xviii 15–43. These figures do not foreclose the issue in the Passion narrative—where, conceivably, the Evangelist's procedure might be very different—but they do establish the fact that, as a rule, Luke follows Mark closely.

---

[1] 'The theory that this collection was formed by building on to extracts from Q material collected by St Luke during his visit to Palestine, particularly during his stay at Caesarea, is an illuminating theory which seems to fit the main facts and may well be accepted' (*op. cit.* p. 255).

The percentage of 27 in the Passion narrative, low as it is, is even less favourable to the hypothesis of Markan origin than the figure suggests. The relevant facts are as follows. (1) The Markan words are not evenly distributed, but frequently occur in clusters. (2) These groups have the appearance of secondary strata. (3) They include many of Sir John Hawkins's instances of variation of Luke's order as compared with that of Mark. (4) Their sequence, relatively to each other, is that of Mark's Gospel. It was the concurrence of these striking phenomena which led me, in *Behind the Third Gospel*, to isolate fourteen passages[1] and describe them as 'Markan insertions' in Luke's fundamentally non-Markan story. 'We are left with the impression that, coming to the Markan story with his own narrative in mind, St Luke has noted certain features in Mark which he desires to use, and that then, returning to his own work, he has introduced these borrowings in their original order at such points in his story as the existing matter permitted.'[1] I do not think that Mr Hunkin does justice to this argument. He treats two of the points mentioned above (the third and fourth) separately, but does not take account of the fact that the hypothesis covers all four. Observing that my list of 'insertions' follows the Markan sequence, he suggests that, roughly speaking, and with certain important omissions, it gives 'a table of contents of Lk. xxii 14–xxiv 12'. 'If these are "Markan insertions", he continues, 'then the framework of the whole section is Markan.' This is adroit, but I do not think the contention will bear scrutiny. Not even with the qualifications mentioned can the list be called 'a table of contents'. It consists of six sayings, a list, a quotation, two narratives, and references to four details in the Passion story. It is fair to say that if any one submitted this list as an Index to the Passion story, it would have to be returned forthwith. A second objection is the fact that, with this list as a framework, it is very difficult to give a convincing explanation of the construction of the Passion narrative. The account of the Trial before Pilate is a case in point (Lk. xxiii 1–25); for here, apart from verse 3—a 'Markan insertion', as I believe—only 35 words are common to Luke and Mark, and not one is significant.[2] Nor is the Markan origin of the Crucifixion story at all probable.[3] (1) Of the 307 words of Mk. xv 20b–41 only 90 (or 29·3 per cent.) occur in Lk. xxiii 26–49. (2) This number includes definite articles, and instances of καί, δέ, and αὐτός, 28 in all. (3) Of the remaining 62 words 29 are accounted for by the references to (*a*) Simon of Cyrene, (*b*) the casting of lots, (*c*) the Superscription, (*d*) the Darkness and Rending. Luke does not mention 'Golgotha', the offering of wine, the 'third hour', the cry of desolation, the surmise about Elijah. Instead of railings by (1) bystanders, (2) chief priests, (3) both thieves, he reports railings by (1) rulers, (2) soldiers, (3) one thief. He introduces the Superscription abruptly, mentions the Rending before the death of Jesus, and gives a different version of the centurion's words. It is clear that the view that Luke is editing Mark's story raises serious difficulties. On this view, the Evangelist omits some of the most striking features in his source, confuses the speakers, very freely alters their words, transposes details, adds new incidents and sayings from his 'special tradition'; and yet produces a story singularly beautiful, lucid, and entirely worthy of its great theme. I prefer to think that in the first instance he wrote without any knowledge of Mark, and subsequently inserted Markan additions at verses 26, 34 b, 38, 44 f. To a greater or less degree the same difficulties will be found in other parts of the story. We can, if we will, make out a case for the view that Luke 'deliberately corrects the Markan narrative', but, I submit, at the cost of credibility; the view that the foundation of the whole is non-Markan is at once simpler and more probable. If this hypothesis is accepted the most formidable difficulties stand in the way of accepting Mr Hunkin's proposed modification of the Proto-Luke Theory. 'If St Luke uses Mark as his principal authority, why does he abandon that source at its final and most important point?'[1]

---

[1] Lk. xxii 19 a, 22, 34, 46 b (?), 50 b, 52–53 a, 54 b–61, xxiii 3, 26, 34 b (?), 38, 44 f, 50–54, xxiv 10 (?)

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 74.

[2] Mr Hunkin's suggestion is that Mark's story 'is re-written, the question, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" remaining as its centre or pivot; and another tradition (preserved by St Luke alone) is inserted in its proper place, viz. that of the trial before Herod Antipas'.

[3] Mr Hunkin's view is that Luke makes several additions to the Markan story, e.g. the words to the women of Jerusalem, the words to the Penitent Thief, the last words of Jesus, and a few minor additions like xxiii 36 (the vinegar).

II

But what of the beginning of 'Proto-Luke'? Has Mr Hunkin disposed of Canon Streeter's suggestion that Lk. iii 1–iv 30 is a solid block of non-Markan matter? The idea of Luke's supposed aversion to 'camel's hair'[2] is not very convincing, I think. Surely the Evangelist knew his Old Testament.[3] Nor need we suppose that Luke has omitted Mark's reference to angels in the Temptation story because διηκόνουν is in the imperfect. Luke has a partiality for angelic ministries, and the presumption is that he is dependent on Q alone.[4] Whether we can say now where more properly the Evangelist should have placed the Genealogy, is beside the point. The point is that, if iii 1–iv 30 is the opening section of Q + L, the Evangelist has put the Genealogy immediately after his first reference to Jesus. On the Proto-Luke Hypothesis the place of the sixfold date (iii 1 f) is equally happy. Justification for the position of these elements is certainly possible on the accepted theory, as Mr Hunkin so clearly shows; the point is that on Streeter's theory defence is not necessary; the liabilities are assets. Misgivings are also started[5] by the suggestion that Luke may have deliberately altered the text of Mk. i 11.[6] If it is genuine, the Western reading in Lk. iii 22 ('Thou art my Son: to-day have I begotten thee') is surely an added reason for presuming the non-Markan origin of the account of the Baptism, a view which is further supported by the presence in Mt. and Lk. of ἀνοίγω and the participle of βαπτίζω.

---

[1] Cf. *Behind the Third Gospel* p. 184.

[2] Mr Hunkin's point is that the reference to 'camel's hair' (Mk. i 6) may have been intentionally omitted by Luke, since to the Hellenistic mind linen is the proper material for a religious teacher.

[3] Cf. 2 Kings i 8, Zech. xiii 4.

[4] Mt. iv 11 b is, of course, taken from Mark.

[5] Nor are they allayed by Dr Burkitt's article in the *Expository Times* (Feb. 1927) on 'The Baptism of Jesus'.

[6] It will be remembered, of course, that this is only one of two alternatives considered by Mr Hunkin. The second is the opinion that if the 'Neutral' text is genuine, the insertion of the Genealogy at this point needs no elaborate explanation.

Stated summarily, Mr Hunkin's view is that two extracts from Q + L, Lk. iii 7–20 and iv 1 ff, have been fitted into the Markan framework, the points of attachment being the Markan passages, iii 2 b–4, 21 f, and iv 14 f. The objection is that none of these passages is indubitably Markan; the third partly agrees with Mk. i 14 in substance; the second (the Baptism) is more probably derived from Q; while in the case of the first, the only passage which need be derived from Mark is the phrase 'preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins'. If these are the points at which Q + L matter is inserted, one might reasonably expect fairly close linguistic agreement with Mark, since the proposed mode of compilation would involve direct reference to the Markan original. A good deal is made of the editorial passage, iii 18–20,[1] which records the imprisonment of John. Is not this passage evidence of the process of dovetailing? The affirmative answer is tempting until we pursue the enquiry further. Lk. iii 18–20 is followed by the story of the Baptism, and at this point—if Mr Hunkin is right—the Evangelist must have consulted Mk. i 9–11. There he would read the express statement that 'Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, *and was baptized of John in the Jordan*'. Under these circumstances one would expect the elimination of iii 18–20, or at any rate the statement that Herod 'shut up John in prison'. Under any circumstances the anticipatory reference to John's imprisonment in iii 18–20 is difficult; but the difficulty would be to some extent concealed, if, as seems likely, Luke drew the story of the Baptism from a non-Markan source which did not mention the part played by John. It should be added that, even if iii 18–20 already stood in Q + L, it would not follow that iii 7–20 was an isolated section, a mere fragment in a formless collection. Editorial summaries in the course of continuous narrative are common features in the Lukan style.[2] For the reasons given, the attempt to show that Lk. iii 1–iv 30 is not a solid block of non-Markan matter, seems to fail; and if this be so, we are confronted by the fact that Luke has used neither the beginning nor the end of Mark, his alleged foundation document.

---

[1] Observing that iii 18–20 'looks very much like an editorial conclusion', Mr Hunkin suggests that Luke 'may be fitting into a framework derived from Mark material from another document, Q + L', *op. cit.* p. 252.

[2] Cf. Lk. i 66, 80, ii 40, 52, iv 13, 14 f, vii 1, viii 1–3, xi 53 f, xiii 22, xvii 11, xix 28.

III

It is not necessary to follow in further detail Mr Hunkin's account of the way in which matter from Q+L may have been fitted into the Markan outline. It must be readily admitted that a good account of the working of this hypothesis will always be possible. Indeed, if this were not the case, the view that Mark is Luke's foundation source could not have held its ground so long. Those who support the Proto-Luke Hypothesis do not doubt the relative value of the alternative theory. 'It is not to be denied that the accepted theory explains many facts within the Third Gospel, but the question is whether it explains all the facts, and whether indeed the facts which it does explain are not better accounted for by the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.'[1] This is the real issue, and, so far as I can see, it is one of which Mr Hunkin's proposed modification does not take account.

When all has been said for the theory that Mark is Luke's principal source, several pertinent questions still remain for discussion. Why, for example, when a Markan story is omitted, does not Luke insert his parallel version at the same place in the Markan outline? The Call of the Apostles and the Anointing are cases in point. Must we not say that Q+L had form and order, and that Luke preferred that order? When the cases are frequent, as they are, and extend to comparatively small matters,[2] recourse to the idea of floating tradition becomes increasingly difficult. Again, why are extracts from Q and material from Mark segregated in the Third Gospel? The admission that Q enters into the final composition only through the document Q+L is satisfactory, so far as it goes. But has Mr Hunkin done justice to all that is thereby involved? *Must not Q+L have been a document which possessed relative fixity of structure?* Had it been a loose collection of discourse, the discourse sometimes embedded in anecdote, its dismemberment and distribution within the Markan outline would almost certainly have followed. Further, why is so much of Mark (about half) omitted by the Third Evangelist? The different reasons given by exponents of the accepted theory expose the seriousness of a situation which presents no difficulty to supporters of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. An explanation must also be given of the consecutive character of the non-Markan sections. How is it that, beginning with iii 1, and neglecting all that comes from Mark, we obtain a readable story, fragmentary it is true, and broken at the opening of the Passion story, yet none the less a narrative which moves towards its inevitable climax? And why is no such unity discernible in the Markan sections? These belong to what is supposed to be the foundation document; and, in consequence, a modest degree of continuity is not too much to expect. Is the expectation fulfilled? I suggest that, on the contrary, the Markan sections are fragments; 'topical panels' would not be an unfair description. Lk. iv 31–44 and xx 1–xxi 11 describe important days in the life of Jesus; v 12–vi 11 and viii 4–50 are Galilean sections, the latter containing a parabolic section, viii 4–21, and a collection of wonder-narratives, viii 22–ix 17; xviii 15–43 is a 'panel' of journey-stories; xix 29–36 and xix 45 f are isolated incidents; and xxii 1–13 records incidents leading up to the Passion story, in which, I have urged, the Markan passages are pendants. What unity have these sections? Do they preserve that continuity manifest in Mark, and illustrated so clearly in the great day at Caesarea Philippi which Luke indeed describes, but does not identify? Do not these sections in point of fact supply the obvious deficiencies of the document Q + L? These are some of the difficulties left over by the accepted theory, and they still remain if Mr Hunkin's suggestions are accepted. The claim of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is that it meets these difficulties. It accounts for the presence of parallel versions in a different sequence by the Evangelist's preference for Proto-Luke. It explains the fusion of Q and L by the hypothesis that the Markan matter is a later stratum. It justifies the 'Markan omissions' by the plea that Luke drew from Mark only what was needed to expand his original draft. It does not need to explain the continuity of the non-Markan sections, and the topical character of the Markan borrowings is equally part of its data.

---

[1] *Behind the Third Gospel* p. 182 f.

[2] Cf. *The Four Gospels* p. 210.

IV

The danger of exploiting the Proto-Luke Hypothesis for historical purposes is so great that Mr Hunkin's warning on this matter is heartily to be welcomed. But I must challenge his contention that, in estimating the historical value of Proto-Luke, I seem 'to go too far as well as not far enough'. Nothing that I have ever written countenances the uncritical view that the L tradition is 'naïve or primitive in the sense of being unrevised', or may be thought of as 'raw material'. On the contrary, I have pointed out that the narratives of Proto-Luke outside the Passion story are 'seen as through a veil, by which details and sharp outlines are hidden', and that the 'combination of simplicity and vagueness' suggests that they 'may not have been obtained at absolutely first hand'.[1] Again, I have said that Proto-Luke is 'a tool which must be handled with knowledge and discretion, with regard to its limitations as well as to its real merits',[2] and in the chapter on 'The Historical Value of Proto-Luke' have endeavoured to observe this principle. It is true that I do claim that Proto-Luke is a first-rate historical authority, comparable to Mark, echoing in this respect Canon Streeter's estimate.[1] But I have also said that, especially for the Galilean Ministry, Mark 'is and must be our chief guide';[2] that 'an estimate of Proto-Luke which does not recognize this fact will only serve to bring the hypothesis into disrepute';[3] and that 'it would be absurd to suggest that the comparison leads to any wholesale depreciation of Mark as a historical authority',[4] since its position in this respect is 'much too well assured'. It is only too apparent that qualifications of this kind cannot be too clearly and strongly expressed. The charge of not going 'far enough' is equally without foundation. I could not agree, unreservedly, that to a large extent the basis of the L tradition in genuine dominical reminiscences 'has long been granted by the majority of scholars—of British scholars at least'. Here the saving clause is the qualification. As regards British scholars in general, the position is as Mr Hunkin describes it,[5] and I have devoted half a chapter to the record of some of their labours. But outside Great Britain the situation is very different. One cannot forget Loisy's commentary, or the point of view expressed in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, or Harnack's spirited protest against widespread critical estimates of the Lukan writings in general, and the Acts in particular.[6] It is with such things in mind that I have pressed the claim that Proto-Luke throws back the Lukan portraiture of Jesus into the earliest stages of Gospel tradition; and to say this is neither to say 'too little' nor 'too much'.

---

[1] *Behind the Third Gospel* p. 251. Cf. also p. 252 f.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 254.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

THE OLD MALABAR LITURGY.

THE ancient Christian community of southern India must surely enlist the interest of every one interested in Church History or in Liturgy, whether it was founded by the Apostle St Thomas, or in the 4th century, or in the 7th. As is well known, the Malabari Christians were rediscovered in the 16th century by the Portuguese Jesuits, and the ancient Liturgy which they used was revised and expurgated by the Portuguese Archbishop of Goa, Aleixio de Menezes, at the Synod of Diamper in 1599.

The two articles contributed by Dom R. H. Connolly to this JOURNAL in 1914 (*J. T. S.* xv 396–425, 569–589) made a substantial advance in our knowledge of the history of the Malabar Liturgy. Whereas it had been assumed that Menezes had drastically transformed the native Liturgy and that its earlier form was now irrecoverable, Dom Connolly proved that the changes were small in extent (though in some respects important in intention), and that they had been duly recorded. The revisers had, in fact, faithfully carried out their declared intention: '*utque antiquus ritus, quantum patitur fidei sinceritas ac doctrinae puritas, servetur*' (p. 422). When we substitute the few phrases which the revisers say they changed for the corresponding words of the revised text, we get exactly the (now) well-known East-Syrian Liturgy of the Apostles (i.e. Addai and Mari), still used by the East-Syrian Christians, the Church called also 'Assyrian' and 'Nestorian'. This, therefore, was the Liturgy used by the Malabari Christians when first the Portuguese rediscovered them.

---

[1] Cf. *The Four Gospels* p. 222.

[2] *Behind the Third Gospel* p. 234.

[3] *Ibid.*, cf. p. 254.

[4] *Op. cit.* p. 245.

[5] Not, however, without neglect or depreciation of the Lukan tradition in the interests of Mark. Cf. *Christian Beginnings* p. 54 f, and witness Mr Hunkin's closing sentence: 'It is material which has been so skilfully woven into a patterned fabric that the original constituents of it can now be distinguished with difficulty and recovered only in part', *op. cit.* p. 262.

[6] Cf. *The Acts of the Apostles* pp. xxvi, xli, xlii.

It was a very satisfactory conclusion, both for the faithfulness of the Malabar Church to what it had received and also to the antiquity of the Nestorian Rite. The only objection was that it seemed too satisfactory. Could we say of this Rite, to adopt the words of Edmund Bishop, quoting an unnamed German writer: 'Both Churches agree in this matter, not because they have mutually influenced each other, but because both of them, in contrast with many Greek communities, preserved what was ancient' (*J. T. S.* xv 590)? ' I fear not. The object of this Note is to point out the possibility that, when the Malabar Liturgy was revised in 1599, it had only been used in India for about a century.

J. A. Assemani, in his wonderful *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, gives a long account of an embassy sent by the Malabari Christians in the year 1490 to Simeon, Catholicus of the Nestorians (*B. O.* iii 1, 590). Two of the three delegates arrived safely at Mosul, and asked the Catholicus to send them a Bishop, as owing to persecution from Indian Moslems they had now for a long time been without clergy. Simeon found the two delegates well instructed in the Faith; he sent them to stay for a time in a monastery and ordained them priests, and he consecrated two Syrians, Thomas and John, to go to India with them and be Bishops there. The two Bishops and the two Malabaris arrived safely in India and were met with great joy by the Christians, who received them with a procession bearing a book of the Gospels, a cross and a censer (*sic*),—nothing is said about service-books,—and so Church life in southern India was resumed. Bishop Thomas returned very soon to Mosul, but Bishop John ordained fresh clerics, and they kept such close touch with the successors of the Catholicos, that when the Malabar Church after a few years began to enter into relations with the Portuguese missionaries (1504) letters were sent to the Catholicus to inform him.

For our purposes the fact that is most important in all this is that the Malabaris had in 1490 been for some time without a clergy. Who can doubt that when Bishop John from Mesopotamia appeared to restart the ecclesiastical organization he brought with him service-books of the Nestorian use and that the clergy whom he ordained used the books of their Bishop? When we bear in mind the story told by Assemani there is no mystery at all how the pre-Roman service used by the Malabaris came to be so like the Nestorian Rite. It *is* the Nestorian Rite, as practised by the Nestorians of Mesopotamia about 1490.

No doubt the Liturgy of Addai and Mari is very ancient. That is proved by the Homilies of Narsai (500 A.D.). In fact, it is older than Narsai, for Narsai's form of it appears to be a slightly revised form of this ancient service. No doubt also that the Malabari Church had always been in near relationship with the Nestorians of Mesopotamia, if it was not actually founded by them, for it was to the Nestorian Catholicus that the Malabaris sent, when they needed a fresh supply of clergy. But we cannot use the Malabar Rite as evidence for the Nestorian Rite in India earlier than the end of the 15th century, for there is nothing to suggest that the service-books used by the new clergy were an old and unrevised form taken from surviving Malabari liturgical codices.

In Dom Connolly's second article (p. 578 f.) there is an interesting quotation from Raulin about the Malabar *forma consecrationis*. It seems that when the 'Chaldean Bishops from Babylon' came they added to or subtracted from the *forma consecrationis* at will. It was therefore then the custom to recite our Lord's words of Institution in some form or other, but the formula was not fixed. It could hardly, therefore, have stood in the Prayer-Books, and the oral tradition of what exactly it was proper to say was not yet fixed. Thus we gather that the service-books were like the existing Nestorian MSS of 'Addai and Mari', while the custom of including words of Institution orally had already sprung up. The *Antistes quidam*, therefore, who introduced and caused to be written out the formula quoted by Connolly from Raulin (p. 579), seems to have been a Malabari bishop of the 15th century. My impression is that he must have already been in touch with the Portuguese, and that his formula, while not a quotation of the Roman formula, was suggested by it. As Dom Connolly remarks, we would gladly know more about this Malabar prelate, but I feel sure that he lived after the Nestorian revival of 1490.

The conclusions of this Note are negative, and I am sorry the facts point the way they do. One would have wished to be able to prove that the beautiful and ancient Liturgy of Addai and Mari had had a long history in India. That may indeed have been the case, but I feel that the way the evidence points is that the actual Rite found in possession by the Portuguese in the 16th century in Malabar had been brought there less than a century previously.

F. C. Burkitt

SIX NOTES.

I

S. LUKE XIX 21: *αἴρεις ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκας.*

My colleague Dr J. A. Smith has called my attention to a paper of Jac. Bernays (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ed. Usener, Berlin, 1885, i pp. 272 sq.) in which are collected a number of passages illustrating what Plummer (*S. Luke* p. 441) describes as 'perhaps a current proverbial expression for a grasping person'. This note of Plummer's suggests that this paper, or the matter collected in it, is not well known and has not been used in commentaries on the Parable, at any rate in England. It will perhaps be worth while, therefore, to reprint the passages here.

1. Philo *Hypothetica* (ap. Eus. *P. E.* viii 7 [358]) *μυρία δὲ ἄλλα ἐπὶ τούτοις ὅσα καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγράφων ἐθῶν καὶ νομίμων κἂν τοῖς νόμοις αὐτοῖς· ἃ τις παθεῖν ἐχθαίρει μὴ ποιεῖν αὐτόν·* **ἃ μὴ κατέθηκεν** *μηδ'* **ἀναιρεῖσθαι** *μηδ' ἐκ πρασιᾶς μηδ' ἐκ ληνοῦ μηδ' ἐξ ἅλωνος.*

2. Josephus *c. Apion.* ii 27 **ὃ μὴ κατέθηκέ τις οὐκ ἀναιρήσεται**: *ib.* 30 *κἂν ὑφέληταί τις ἀλλότριον κἂν* **ὃ μὴ κατέθηκεν ἀνέληται.**

3. Diog. Laert. i 57 **ἃ μὴ ἔθου μὴ ἀνέλῃ** (traced to Solon).

4. Plato *Laws* xi 913 C *κάλλιστον νόμων . . . καὶ ἁπλούστατον καὶ οὐδαμῇ ἀγεννοῦς ἀνδρὸς νομοθέτημα ὃς εἶπεν* **Ἃ μὴ κατέθου μὴ ἀνέλῃ.**

5. Aelian *Var. hist.* iii 46 *Σταγειριτῶν* [illegible] *οὗτος καὶ πάντῃ Ἑλληνικός·* **Ὃ μὴ κατέθου,** *φησί,* **μὴ λάμβανε**: *ib.* iv 1 *Βύβλιος ἀνὴρ ἐν ὁδῷ περιτυχὼν οὐδὲν* **ὧν μὴ κατέθετο ἀναιρεῖται·** *οὐ γὰρ ἡγεῖται τὸ τοιοῦτον εὕρημα ἀλλὰ ἀδίκημα.*

Dr Smith himself adds the following two passages.

6. Plato *Laws* viii 844 E *ὃς δ' ἂν τὴν γενναίαν νῦν λεγομένην σταφυλὴν ἢ τὰ γενναῖα σῦκα ἐπονομαζόμενα ὀπωρίζειν βούληται, ἐὰν μὲν ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων λαμβάνῃ ὅπως ἂν ἐθέλῃ καὶ ὁπόταν βούληται καρπούσθω, ἐὰν δ' ἐξ ἄλλων μὴ πείσας ἑπομένως τῷ νόμῳ τῷ* **μὴ κινεῖν ὅτι μὴ κατέθετο,** *ἐκείνως ἀεὶ ζημιούσθω.*

7. *ib.* xii 941 C *ἐάν τίς τι κλέπτῃ δημόσιον μέγα ἢ καὶ σμικρὸν τῆς αὐτῆς δίκης δεῖ· σμικρόν τε γὰρ ὁ κλέπτων ἔρωτι μὲν ταὐτῷ, δυνάμει δὲ ἐλάττονι κέκλοφεν, ὅ τε τὸ μεῖζον* **κινῶν οὐ καταθέμενος** *ὅλον ἀδικεῖ.*

Erasmus in the *Adagia* (*Opera*, ed. Leclerc, Leyden 1703, ii c. 813) has *Quae non posuisti ne tollas*, referring for it to passages 3 and 4 above; his editor in a foot-note refers to his own note on Lev. vi 3 (Jo. Clericus *Mosis Prophetae libri v* ii p. 225), where he cites 3, 4 and 5. Neither of them mentions S. Luke xix 21.

Evidently Plummer's 'perhaps' is unnecessary.

It will be noticed that 1 and 6 also illustrate *καὶ θερίζεις ὃ οὐκ ἔσπειρας* of the Parable and its relation to the 'proverbial expression'.

II

'SOUL, BODY, SPIRIT.'

IN a Note under this heading in *J. T. S.* ii pp. 273 sq. I was able to cite only two instances of this curious order, or the reverse of it, in Latin writers. I have since noticed three more instances.

De Sacramentis v 8 'Iam tunc ergo Salomon inducit nuptias vel Christi et Ecclesiae, vel spiritus et carnis et animae.'

Etherius and Beatus *Ep. ad Elipand.* i 100 'denique homo perfectus ex tribus constat, id est anima et corpore et spiritu.' And again *ib.* 102.

III

S. JULIUS *Ep. ad Eusebian.* AP. S. ATH. *Apol. c. Arian.* 35.

Ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὁρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια ;

Everywhere, from Baronius, the Benedictine *S. Athanasii Opera*, and Mansi, down to Mgr. Batiffol's *La paix constantinienne* and Dr Kidd's *History of the Church*, I observe that *ἔνθεν* in this passage is uniformly rendered *hinc*, d'ici, 'from here', i. e. from Rome; and the same is implied in the paraphrases in the French version (Leclercq) of Hefele and in Duchesne's *Histoire ancienne de l'église*. But surely *ἔνθεν* does not mean 'from here', but either 'from there', or 'whence', or 'then', 'after that'. Whether S. Julius himself or his chancery was responsible for the language of the two letters included in the *Apologia c. Arianos*, the one to the Eusebians (21–35), the other to the Alexandrines (52 sq.), it is clear, as is natural enough, that they were not written by any one who thought in Greek or habitually spoke it. The letter to the Alexandrines contains three flagrant Latinisms: *ἵν᾽ οὕτως εἴπω*, *ut ita dicam*; *εὐφραίνει*, used impersonally, *iuvat*; and even *συνέστηκεν*, *constat*, 'it is evident'; and possibly the uncommon construction of the aorist participle with the auxiliary verb, which occurs five times in the letter to the Eusebians (22 *προτρεψάμενος ἤμην*: 23 *ἦσαν ἁμαρτήσαντες*: 30 *ἦν εὑρεθείς*: 34 *ἦσαν καταγνωσθέντες*: 35 *ἦν ὑποπτευθέν*) or such a phrase as *ἔχειν αὐτὸν, ὥσπερ καὶ εἴχομεν, ἐπίσκοπον* (32), is not unaffected by Latin. Consequently I conclude that *καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν* simply renders *et sic deinde.*

IV

S. GREG. NYSSEN. *Antirrheticus* 12.

Προϋπάρχει, φησίν [ὁ Ἀπολλινάριος], ὁ ἄνθρωπος Χριστός, οὐχ ὡς ἑτέρου ὄντος παρ᾽ αὐτὸν τοῦ πνεύματος, τουτέστι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς τοῦ κυρίου ἐν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσει θείου πνεύματος ὄντος.

S. Gregory understood *τοῦ κυρίου* to be the genitive of ὁ Κύριος: for in c. 13 he says *φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι ὁ* Κύριος *ἐν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου κτλ.* Similarly Gallandi *Bibl. Patr.* vi p. 526 translates 'ac si Dominus'; Dorner (*Entwicklungsgesch.* i p. 1002) prints Κυρίου, with a capital; and Dr Voisin *L'Apollinarisme* p. 299 translates 'en ce sens que le Seigneur'—all without comment. The result is that the sentence, to say the least of it, is not lucid: 'The Man Christ pre-exists . . . in the sense that the Lord is divine spirit in the nature of the God-Man.' But, as Dr Lietzmann (*Apollinaris* p. 211 n. 27) has already pointed out, it is clear that *τοῦ κυρίου* is the genitive, not of ὁ Κύριος, but of *τὸ κύριον*, what is elsewhere called *τὸ κυριώτατον* or *τὸ ὑπερέχον* (*Antirrhet.* 23, 24), the ruling or decisive factor, viz. the *νοῦς* or *πνεῦμα*, what makes the humanity to be a humanity (in the Apollinarian sense) and not merely *σάρξ* and *ψυχή*. (Cp. Ar. *Eth. Nic.* x 7 § 9 *εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῷ ὄγκῳ μικρόν ἐστι* [ὁ νοῦς], *δυνάμει καὶ τιμιότητι πολὺ μᾶλλον πάντων* ὑπερέχει· *δόξειε δ' ἂν καὶ εἶναι ἕκαστος τοῦτο, εἴπερ* τὸ κύριον *καὶ ἄμεινον.*) The meaning of the clause thus becomes clear: 'in the sense that the ruling factor in the nature of the God-Man is divine spirit'.

The intermediate clause, *οὐχ ὡς ἑτέρου ὄντος κτλ.*, is to me quite unintelligible as it stands: it seems in fact to say the opposite of what Apollinarius means. I cannot but think that we ought to read, not *οὐχ ὡς*, but *ὡς οὐχ*, and then the whole becomes clear: 'The Man Christ pre-exists in the sense that the spirit, i. e. God, is none other than [the Man] Himself', his *νοῦς*,—'but that the ruling factor in the nature of the God-Man is divine spirit'. And this is just what Apollinarius says elsewhere (*Antirrhet.* 18): *αὐτὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος . . . Θεός ἐστι . . . ἅτε δὴ τῷ ἰδίῳ πνεύματι Θεὸς ὢν καὶ οὐ Θεὸν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἕτερον παρ' αὐτόν.*

This passage, or rather the first words of it, appear to be the only authentic text of Apollinarius which may seem to supply a basis for the view, first I imagine propounded by Dorner, that he 'ascribed an eternal humanity to the Word', or that *ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* Ἄνθρωπος or *ὁ ἐπουράνιος* Ἄνθρωπος means for him a pre-existent Heavenly Man. For the other passages quoted either represent Gregory's misconception of Apollinarius's doctrine, or do not necessarily imply what Dorner takes them to imply. It is clear enough what Apollinarius means by the pre-existence of the Man. It is only his general doctrine expressed more or less paradoxically. The Man can be said to be pre-existent because that in virtue of which He is man, and not merely animal, His *νοῦς*, is the Eternal Word. And as to 'the Man from heaven', he defines quite clearly what he means by it: Τοῦτον *δέ φησιν* [ὁ Ἀπολλινάριος] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ *διὰ τοῦτο καλεῖσθαι, διότι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ οὐράνιον ἐσαρκώθη* (*Antirrhet.* 14).

It could be wished therefore that Dr Gore (*Belief in Christ* p. 230) would not only have 'deprecated' Dr Relton's 'attempt to revive the idea of Apollinarius', but would have dismissed this interpretation of Apollinarian doctrine as a phantasy.

V

S. GREG. M. *Epp.* ix 26.

ORATIONEM autem Dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus quia mos apostolorum fuit ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent: et valde mihi inconveniens visum est ut precem quam scholasticus composuerat super oblationem diceremus et ipsam traditionem quam Redemptor noster composuit non diceremus.

1. The first clause of this notorious passage has generally been understood in the sense 'we say the Lord's Prayer directly after the Canon for the reason that it was the custom of the apostles to consecrate the host of the oblation with the [Lord's] Prayer itself alone'. Thus Amalarius, in the first edition of *de Officiis* i 15 (Hittorp, ed. 1591, p. 704), evidently on the authority of this passage, says that in the Mass of the Presanctified the apostolic consecration, which recited only the Lord's Prayer over the Lord's body and blood, is reproduced; and, were it not for the direction of the *Ordo Romanus*, that one kind be reserved on Maundy Thursday for use on Good Friday, it would be unnecessary to reserve, since the Lord's Prayer would suffice for the consecration of the bread, as it already suffices for that of the chalice. Similarly, Walafrid Strabo *de Exordiis* 23 has: 'relatio maiorum est ita primis temporibus missas fieri solitas sicut modo in Parasceve Paschae . . . communicationem facere solemus: id est, praemissa Oratione Dominica et, sicut ipse Dominus noster praecepit, commemoratione Passionis adhibita, eos corpori dominico communicasse et sanguini quos ratio permittebat.' (Is the *commemoratio* here the veneration of the cross? Cp. *Sacr. Gel.* I xli *Et venit sacerdos ante altare, adorans crucem Domini et osculans. Et dicit* Oremus. *Et sequitur* Praeceptis salutaribus moniti *et oratio Dominica. Inde* Libera nos Domine quaesumus. *Haec omnia expleta adorant omnes sanctam crucem et communicant*). Martène (*de ant. Eccl. Rit.* I iii 1 § 3) is no doubt right in seeing an allusion to Gregory in Ratherius of Verona (*de Contemptu Canonum* 1) where he says 'illa specialissima oratione consecretur oblatio populo porrigenda ubi Deo dicitur *Pater noster qui es in caelis*'. Leo VII (*Ep.* iii *ad Gallos et Germanos*) deprecates the use of the *Paternoster* as an ordinary grace before meat 'quia in sancti-

ficatione corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi hanc *solummodo orationem* sancti apostoli decantabant'. Berno of Reichenau (*de quibusdam* 1) quotes Gregory as describing the mass as it was 'in exordio nascentis ecclesiae', without indicating in what precise sense he understood him. Bernold of Constance (*Micrologus* 12), in partly quoting, partly paraphrasing Gregory, makes him say no more than that the apostles were believed to have used the Lord's Prayer 'in confectione eorundem sacramentorum', so leaving it possible to suppose that in his view Gregory's meaning was at most that, while the *Paternoster* was the only *prayer* in the apostolic consecration, this did not exclude the use of a further formula which was not strictly prayer. Anyhow, this is the view of Sicard of Cremona (*Mitrale* iii 1, vi 13), who assuming that the Words of Institution had always been essential, and not regarding the recitation of them as prayer, took Gregory to mean that the apostolic form was the Words of Institution followed by the *Paternoster*. Durandus (*Rationale* IV i 4, VI lxxvii 26) reproduces Sicard almost verbally; and this interpretation was revived by Bona (*Rer. lit.* I v 3) and Le Brun (*Explication* tome ii, diss. ii 2 § 7). But the older interpretation—that S. Gregory makes the Lord's Prayer to be the exclusive apostolic form of consecration—has been if not *the* common one, at least *a* common one, among modern writers, including e.g. Martène (*ubi supra*), Bingham (*Antt.* XV iii 28), Duchesne (*Origines*, ed. 1, p. 176), and J. Wordsworth (*Ministry of Grace* p. 382).

Now all these writers, from Amalarius onwards, with the possible exception of Berno who is not explicit, have assumed that *oblationis* depends on *hostiam*. But as long ago as 1870 Probst (*Lit. d. drei ersten Jahrb.* p. 356) pointed out—what, when it is once pointed out, is obvious enough, and the only wonder is that it was not perceived before—that *oblationis* depends, not on *hostiam*, but on *orationem*; and Dom Cabrol (*Dict. d'arch. et lit.* ii (2) c. 1852) and Mgr Batiffol (*Leçons sur la messe*, 1919, p. 278: *L'eucharistie*, ed. 1920, p. 352) have lately insisted upon it anew. Consequently S. Gregory in fact says the exact opposite of what he has been supposed to say: viz. that 'it was the custom of the apostles to consecrate the host with the Prayer of Oblation itself alone'. And, as Mgr Batiffol has noticed, in Victorinus Afer *adv. Arian.* i 30, *oratio oblationis* means the Canon, while the title of Sarapion's anaphora is Εὐχὴ προσφόρου. What, therefore, S. Gregory says is that the apostolic custom was to consecrate only with the εὐχαριστία or anaphora or canon, without any *Paternoster* following it. It will be remembered that by a similar re-sorting of the words Dom Connolly cleared up the difficulty in S. Innocent I's letter to Decentius (*J. T. S.* xx pp. 215 sqq., xxiii p. 410).

2. The prayer 'quam scholasticus composuerat' was understood by Bernold to be the Canon, and he remarks that S. Gregory has given us all the information we possess concerning the authorship of it. Berno also, though less explicit, evidently understands the Canon to be meant, but corrects the Pope; 'Attamen ipsum canonem non unus solus totum composuit, sed per tempora aliud alius interposuit et adiecit': and he adds the partly legendary account of the developement of the Roman Liturgy collected out of the *Liber Pontificalis*. And modern writers have, I suppose, almost universally taken the same view of Gregory's words. Dom Cabrol and Mgr Batiffol, so understanding them, remark that he speaks 'assez dédaigneusement', 'un peu dédaigneusement' of the Canon. This sounds unlikely. And there are exceptions. Le Brun quotes from Maldonatus an argument, unconvincing enough, to the effect that it is not the whole Canon, but only the paragraph *Hanc igitur* which is attributed to the *scholasticus*. Grisar and Thalhofer (see Thalhofer *Handbuch*, ed. 1883–1890, ii p. 261) both understand the prayer to be the Prayer of the Fraction, *Credimus Domine*, intervening between the Canon and the *Paternoster* in the Stowe Missal, which they suppose to have stood here in the Roman Sacramentary of S. Gregory's day until he abolished it and so made the Lord's Prayer to follow immediately after the Canon. I should like to propose for consideration another interpretation.

S. Gregory's argument, in recalling that the apostles consecrated 'ad ipsam solummodo Orationem Oblationis', implies that something has since been added: and my suggestion is that this addition is the prayer 'quam scholasticus composuerat', and that, when this prayer is described as said 'super oblationem', it is almost expressly named, being in fact the Roman *Super oblata* or *Secreta*, the Ambrosian *Super oblatam*, the Offertory Prayer. So that what S. Gregory says is this: 'It was the apostolic usage to consecrate with an Anaphora only; but seeing that a *Super oblata* of purely human composition has since been added, to be said over the unconsecrated oblation, it seemed to me only congruous to say the Lord's own Prayer over the consecrated oblation.' This seems to satisfy the language, to make the argument, such as it is, rather more intelligible, and to relieve the Pope of any suspicion of 'speaking disdainfully' of the Canon or of claiming to improve upon apostolic usage.

3. Where then did Gregory find the record of the supposed 'mos apostolorum'? There are two obvious sources from either or both of which, assumed to be authentic records of apostolic usage and precept, he might have drawn his information: viz. the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. Both of these satisfy the required conditions, for in neither of them is the

Anaphora either preceded by an Offertory Prayer or followed by the Lord's Prayer (*Ap. Constt.* viii 12 § 3, 13: Hauler *Fragmenta Veronensia* pp. 106, 112). It is true that Gregory knew no Greek: but the existing MS of the Latin version of the *Apostolic Tradition* is older than his day and the version itself older still; and if there was no Latin translation of the *Constitutions*, yet during the six years of his residence in Constantinople, though he failed to learn Greek, he must have had every opportunity of getting a sufficient knowledge of the 'Clementine Liturgy'.

VI

THE DEFINITION OF CHALCEDON.

THE books seem seldom to have anything to say about the sources of the Definition, and I have never seen them set out at length. It will, therefore, perhaps be of use to tabulate them here.

THE DEFINITION	S. Cyr. *Ep.* iii *ad Nest.* 3
Ἑπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν	Ἑπόμενοι δὲ πανταχοῦ ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὁμολογίαις.
	S. Cyr. *Ep.* ii *ad Nest.*
ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν	ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν προσκυνοῦντες.
	Formula of Reunion A.D. 433[1]
ὁμολογοῦμεν Υἱὸν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι, καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, Θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα·	1 ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, Θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον [Cyr. *Ep. ad Io. Ant.* τέλειος ὢν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειος ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι] ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, 3 ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα·
κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶϲ ἁμαρτίαϲ·	[Heb. iv 15 κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας].
πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡ-	2 πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡ-

---

[1] In S. Cyr. *Ep. ad Ioan. Antioch.* Identical with the confession of the Antiochenes in their letter to Theodosius II in 431 (Mansi v 783), adopted almost verbally by the Synod of 448 (*ib.* vi 678). The numbers in the text mark the order in which the clauses occur in the Formula itself. The Confession of S. Flavian cites the same clauses, in whole or in part, in the order 2, 1, 3, 4.

μᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ θεοτόκου[1] κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,	μᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα·
	4 δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἕνωσις γέγονε· διὸ
ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν Υἱὸν Κύριον μονογενῆ,	ἕνα Χριστόν, ἕνα Υἱόν, ἕνα Κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν.
	Confessio Flaviani
ἐν δύο φύσεσιν	ἐν δύο φύσεσι.
	Session IV *of the Council.*[2]
ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαιρέτως ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον·	ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως.
	S. Cyr. *Ep.* ii *ad Nest.*
οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν,	οὐχ ὡς τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν.
	S. Leo *Ep. ad Flavian.* 3
σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης·	Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturae et substantiae et in unam coeunte personam.
	S. Cyr. *Ep.* ii *ad Nest.*
οὐχ ὡς εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ᾽ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, Θεὸν Λόγον, Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.	ἵνα μὴ . . . τέμνωμεν εἰς δυο τὸν ἕνα Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ Κύριον.

Thus the Council itself contributes practically nothing, and the Definition combines and represents Leo, Cyril, Theodoret, and Flavian—Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople.

F. E. Brightman.

---

[1] The *Formula of Reunion* and the letter to Theodosius acknowledge the title *θεοτόκος* in a further paragraph.

[2] Mansi vii 32: the declaration of the Illyrian bishops, who had had misgivings as to the sufficiency of certain passages in the *Tome* of S. Leo, to the effect that their doubts had been removed by the explanations of the Roman Legates: *πάντα γὰρ ἄνθρωπον ἀναθεμάτισαν . . . μὴ τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρωποπρεπῆ αὐτοῦ* [sc. τοῦ Κυρίου] *εἶναι λέγοντα ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως.*

REVIEWS

Israel amongst the Nations: an Outline of Old Testament History, by NORMAN H. BAYNES. (Student Christian Movement, 1927.)

MR NORMAN BAYNES, whose work on Hellenistic and Byzantine history has long placed students of those periods in his debt, has now rendered invaluable service to Old Testament scholars by the publication of a very extensive series of bibliographical notes and comments which they cannot afford to ignore. The notes in question (pp. 172–314) are relatively more comprehensive and elaborate than the history proper, the Old Testament portion of which, i. e. to the time of Nehemiah and Ezra (pp. 13–125), is supplemented by pages on the influence of Persia and on the Greek period (pp. 125–167). Indeed, after a careful examination of the book it is not unfair to say that the historical outlines are the pegs upon which are hung the numerous notes which elucidate or supplement what is said touching the developement of the history and religion of Israel. Mr Baynes's survey of the whole of the pre-Christian period is, in truth, a rather rapid one; and if this has precluded a serious discussion of various difficult problems, such a discussion was not intended, his aim being, he states, to provide the general reader with a sketch to serve as a background for his study of the Old Testament, a text-book to form an introduction to larger works (p. 7 sq.). As regards his bibliography Mr Baynes tells us that 'the choice of references to modern literature represents only a selection from the reading of one who is no specialist in the history of Israel' (p. 8); and to this one can only say, and with emphasis, that those of us who are by way of being specialists must express unfeigned admiration at his industry. On this score he has surely no need to 'ask for a merciful judgement' from his critics.[1] For my own part, if I occasionally miss a few references to English literature, I find much that had escaped my attention, and knowing how difficult it is to do justice to the many new developements in Old Testament study and to the many conflicting views that now prevail, I cannot but express my sincere appreciation of his packed pages.

In the Preface Mr Baynes expresses the belief that many readers will find the standpoint of his book 'lamentably conservative, if not reactionary': it will be useful to keep before us the not unimportant question wherein the real difference between the two epithets lies. For he goes on to explain that 'the disagreement arises from a fundamental difference of opinion upon the character and value of our sources'

---

[1] A few slight misprints can be corrected in a second edition: p. 199 n. 18 (C. H. W. Johns), p. 229 n. 9 (the fourth word), p. 270 n. 9 (read *Entstehung*), p. 287 n. 33 (read 'Anath-Bethel), and the mis-spelling of Procksch's name (p. 327).

(p. 8): and such words only whet the reader's appetite. There is a marked 'liveliness' in Old Testament studies to-day; there are very diverse opinions concerning both the general value of the Old Testament and the solution of the various problems which it brings. And it need hardly be said that here, Mr Baynes's work as a historian in other than Old Testament fields gives him an authority which must be freely conceded to those who, distinguished in their own field, come over and scrutinize our methods—or the lack thereof, as the case may be. Moreover, the fact that the book is published by the Student Christian Movement gives it an authoritativeness and responsibility which perhaps would not be so spontaneously attributed at the outset to a work appearing under other auspices and from a less familiar pen. Finally, to me personally Mr Baynes's book is of no little interest as I am convinced that the ordinary 'moderate critical' position must advance; and whereas tendencies along distinctly conservative—if not reactionary—lines are now to the fore, my own tendency could presumably be styled radical or sceptical. Hence it may help to clear the air if we may take the book before us as an indication of the impression made upon a trained historian by the methods of modern Old Testament study, and to notice, as we proceed, wherein some of the more important differences appear to lie.

Leaving the Preface—to which I shall return later—we at once find ourselves in the thick of the fray—'We may still write advisedly and with not a little confidence: the history of Israel begins with the stories of the Patriarchs' (p. 14). His opening sentences uncompromisingly attack the 'scepticism'—which I for one share—touching the historical value of these stories. 'It is easy for criticism to overshoot the mark', he says, truly enough; and archaeology has certainly disproved various extreme or sceptical views. But it is necessary to ask, what precisely has been proved or disproved, and what mistakes were made by the sceptical? I, for my own part, certainly believe that some important historical facts lie behind the Book of Genesis, but the question is, *what* facts? and readers who are genuinely interested in the progress of criticism should compare the Book of Genesis with the use that Mr Baynes has been able to make of it, and should form their own opinion of the difference between its contents and Mr Baynes's reconstruction. This is a test any one can make for himself. Further we are reminded that 'though Greek tradition has woven about the Trojan war the rich pattern of epic splendour, that war is no less a fact of history' (p. 13). Precisely. Modern archaeological research has brought home the truth that written traditions are not to be rejected merely because they contain elements deemed to be incredible; but it has none the less proved that there are elements which can only be described as the later trimmings of 'epic splendour'. In all doubtful cases, therefore, we require fuller evidence before we can decide whether any given doubtful element is part of the aforesaid rich pattern or is a fact of history. And here, at the outset, it must be freely recognized that it is much easier nowadays to write 'outlines' of history than to prepare a fuller work where there is space for the more intricate details and discussion is in place. Moreover, much in the Book of Genesis, which I for one could not treat as pre-Mosaic history, illumines the later periods of Israel, periods more important for us from historical and religious points of view. In this way, we pass from history in the narrower sense—events in pre-Mosaic Palestine—to the wider history of the periods when the narratives took shape: this is one of the fundamental differences between the various tendencies of modern Old Testament research (cf. *J. T. S.* xxviii 368 sq.).

No doubt the ballads of Serbia preserve 'an oral memory' of past struggles; and all will agree that 'we badly need a broadly based comparative study of oral tradition and its historical value' (p. 192). But oral tradition preserves both elements of historical truth and elements that are wholly unreliable; it fuses different periods, or persons, or events, and in any doubtful case who shall sever the wheat from the chaff? One has only to work through some of the traditions current in modern Palestine to perceive that neither blind scepticism nor blind credence is in place. And it is a pity that space did not permit Mr Baynes to go into the questions he has raised, and upon which his knowledge of the value of oral tradition in other fields would have been distinctly helpful.

In Old Testament research attention is directed partly to internal criticism—differing or conflicting traditions, their growth, inter-relations, &c., and partly to the external evidence. To the rather ambiguous attitude that Mr Baynes has adopted towards literary criticism I shall advert later; as regards the external evidence one could wish that he had been able to make more use of archaeology and the monuments. He does not bring out, as could be wished, the internal problems which sooner or later confront the serious student of the Old Testament, he does not lead up to them, nor has he shown how external evidence has placed these in a new light. Since a great deal of attention is naturally paid in this book to the external history, this statement will perhaps seem surprising. But if the history of Israel is to begin in pre-Mosaic times surely the evidence for the conditions in early Palestine and Syria is indispensable, yet there seems to be no reference to available translations of the Amarna Letters—Knudtzon's great (German) work is invaluable—or to such reliable sketches as Baikie's *The Amarna Age*. It may, indeed, be said that 'of the religion of the

Patriarchs it is not easy to speak with any certainty' (p. 21); but of the religion of the more or less contemporary Palestine there is much to be said—and it supplies the reader with the required background for his study of the Old Testament. For more than a quarter of a century the Amarna Letters have revolutionized our conceptions of the land, and it is surprising that so little use is made of them in this book.[1] There is a fundamental difference between supplementing the Old Testament here and there by contemporary and external evidence and the patient effort to understand it as a whole in the light which the new material casts upon it. So, when we confine ourselves to the Old Testament, we can naturally realize how much the United Monarchy meant for Jerusalem: 'it gave to the Hebrew Jerusalem, the Holy City, and the Temple . . .' (p. 72 sq.)—it is rather difficult to grasp the varying use of the terms Hebrews and Israelites. But a bibliographical note (p. 229) 'on Jerusalem as an ancient pre-Davidic religious centre' refers us to an article by Böhl on the old-time sanctity of the City; and what we know of pre-Israelite Jerusalem sheds a new light upon the biblical data. Whether external evidence leads to the rehabilitation of older views, or along conservative lines, is less important for a progressive criticism than the fact that it forces us to take notice of it; and it strikes one as a reactionary rather than a conservative step to ignore the bearing of the new material, the more especially when, as in this and other cases, Mr Baynes is not unaware of its existence and the general trend of the evidence for 'Israel among the nations'.

As regards the Exodus Mr Baynes agrees with the common view that 'not all the Israelites entered Egypt' (pp. 29, 201). But when he says that some modern scholars have denied that Israel ever went to sojourn there, Jensen appears to be the only name cited (p. 204 n. 9), and it would be a pity if readers thought that this and certain other isolated views found general support. However, this denial, it seems, lays weight upon the slight traces of Egyptian influence upon Israel in the Old Testament—as a matter of fact this influence upon Palestine and Phoenicia was very strong—and Mr Baynes points out in reply that the Israelites were nomads in Goshen living apart from Egyptian influence. Later on, however, he proceeds to say that at length they were conscripted and 'brought to live with the subjects of the Pharaoh in houses' (p. 29 sq.), and the years of bondage left an indelible mark upon their laws and literature. But this construction of the history which is to explain at once the absence of Egyptian influence in the Old Testament and the profound impression which the escape from bondage made upon the national consciousness, seems to have overlooked the fact that even in the account of the Plagues there are conflicting representations: Israel lives quite apart from the Egyptians (Exod. viii 22 sq., ix 26) or is intermingled with them (e.g. Exod. xi 2, xii 13). To be sure, in a rapid sketch there is no opportunity for attention to minor details, but the reader might have been told in the notes how these and other details complicate a closer study of the events. As it is, we pass from a reference (p. 34) to the 'short-sighted criticism which would minimize the significance of Israel's sojourn in Egypt' to bibliographical remarks on literature, often highly technical, and presupposing problems for which the reader is ill-prepared. So the problem of the Sojourn and the Exodus remains: on the one hand are the internal biblical intricacies which have so far defied any simple solution; and on the other there is abundant evidence for persistent Egyptian cultural influence on Palestine and Phoenicia. In fact the inter-relations between Palestine and Egypt force us to recognize that there could easily have been more than one descent of some tribe or tribes, more than one period of sojourn, and more than one oppression and Exodus.[1] But the canonical traditions have concentrated upon one great epic event, and one only; a grandiose conception of national origins lies at the basis of the Old Testament history, and the course of modern criticism has been continuously directed to an analysis of the narratives in which this great conception is embodied. And Mr Baynes has taken the first step: 'not all the Israelites entered Egypt.' Have we any traces of the national traditions of those who did not enter Egypt? The belief that these can be recognized and followed up has opened new paths in criticism which distinguish 'progressive' from ordinary 'moderate' criticism (cf. *Camb. Anc. Hist.* ii. 359 sq.).

---

[1] e.g. pp. 16, 25 refer to the invading Habiru and the question of their identity with the Hebrews or Israelites.

A fundamental difference of method can also be illustrated when we pass on to the account of the Conquest of Palestine. 'From Kadesh... the Hebrews attempted to enter Palestine from the south, but their courage failed them when they learned the strength of the Canaanite cities' (p. 45). Hence the journey to and settlement on the east of the Jordan. What could be more simple? On the other hand, when one is writing at greater length one is confronted by these evidences: (*a*) the Israelites were in terror at the report brought by Caleb and other spies (Num. xiii), but Caleb for his faith was promised an inheritance in the land (Num. xiv. 24); and (*b*), besides a defeat at Hormah suffered by a people whom Yahweh no longer favoured (cf. xiv 40–45), there was a victory at Hormah in response to a vow to Yahweh, when the Canaanites and their cities were destroyed (xxi 1–3). There are other important details, but the essential fact is this victory at the very gate of the Promised Land, which is taken, by many scholars, to point to some separate movement from Kadesh northwards immediately into Palestine. Accordingly, some elements—Calebites and no doubt others—are supposed to have settled in South Judah, *not* as part of that circuitous march (connected with the *defeat* at Hormah): Kadesh, Edom, Moab, the Jordan and southwards into the districts assigned to the tribes Judah and Simeon, *but* as part of a great movement the full meaning of which is as yet hardly grasped. Now Mr Baynes has—not inexcusably in view of his space—passed over the difficulties which confront modern scholars, yet he refers to the dependence of the tribe of Judah upon alliance and intermarriage: Calebites, Kenites, and Kenizzites being gradually absorbed by the Israelite invaders (p. 47). But he does not tell us whether he believes that Calebites and others moved up from Kadesh, and the reader will find nothing in the notes to warn him that he is at this point on the verge of some extremely important views—partially adopted by Mr Baynes—which to me at least are of the profoundest significance for our conception of the history (*Camb. Anc. Hist.* ii 365, 367; iii 479 sq.; vi 184 sqq.).[1]

---

[1] The view that there were two 'exodi' is by no means unknown.

On coming down to the period covered by the books of Samuel I find it difficult to determine with certainty the meaning of his allusion to my 'scepticism' regarding the Philistine wars (p. 228).[2] In a note containing eight or more bibliographical references there is none to explain his allusion, and I am the more sorry as I explicitly hold that the overthrow of the 'uncircumcised' aliens marked the rise of the monarchy of Israel. There are, however, various data which I do regard with scepticism, and I should have liked to see his criticism of my reasons. For example, Mr Baynes succeeds in combining, in a breath as it were, Samuel's great victory over the Philistines with the rigorous Philistine domination over all Israel amid which the older story of Saul's rise begins (p. 57). It is a vivid bit of impressionism. But it ignores 1 Sam. vii 13 sq. and the lasting effects of Samuel's victory; moreover the way in which Saul summoned the warriors of Israel and Judah to follow him and deliver Jabesh-Gilead from the

---

[1] Very interesting is the suggestion that the settlement in Transjordania 'was probably of greater significance for the Hebrew (*sic*, Israelite) people *than is at first suggested by the Biblical account*' (p. 45, my italics). Some important questions are raised by the two-and-a-half eastern tribes; and it is instructive to notice how closer study has led Mr Baynes to see the difference between the canonical Biblical record and the implications of passages which are otherwise read in the light of that account.

[2] Mr Baynes adopts the common critical view that the central Palestinian tribes were cut off from those of the north and of the south by 'two sundering enclaves of Canaanite strongholds' (p. 46). Let the reader see for himself how seriously the historical value of 1 Samuel is endangered if this view be taken literally.

Ammonites hardly fits in with his next step, as summarized by Mr Baynes, which was to free the land from the Philistines who, by the by, had even driven some of the inhabitants away across the Jordan. There are other difficulties, besides, upon which this is not the occasion to tarry, my sole desire being merely to repeat that there are internal intricacies which only a running rapid sketch is able to ignore, and that the ordinary reader will hardly realize at what cost he has gained his picture of Saul's rise. Keeping narrowly within the covers of the Old Testament a writer may well speak of 'the rapid decline of the Philistine power' (p. 56), but it might have been pointed out that there are allusions to Philistine activity before the rise of the Omri dynasty (1 Kings xv 27, xvi 15)—very significant in view of Omri's power—and that the Assyrian evidence throws valuable light upon the persistence of political and at times anti-Israelite activity among the city-states of the Philistine coast.

The Old Testament has concentrated Philistine traditions upon one great age—the age of their invasion and overthrow—but the historical student cannot ignore the later inter-relations between the Philistine coast and the *hinterland*, and the traditions that must have prevailed. Mr Baynes observes that 'the very remarkable character of the Hebrew historiography of this period (i. e. of the Books of Samuel) has not received due recognition' (p. 228). Certainly there is still very much to be said; but already modern writers have directed attention to the endeavour of the ancient historians to narrate the rise of their monarchy from the differing standpoints of Israel (Saul) and of Judah (David), to the strong pro-Judaean and anti-Israelite tendencies, and to the effort to lead up both to the Davidic dynasty and the Messianic idea, and to the institution of the temple and the supremacy of the Zadokite priests over their rivals from outside. The fundamental change in the course of criticism is that whereas earlier scholars treated the Books of Samuel as *objective* history, the trend of progressive criticism is to regard both these books and the corresponding portions of 1 Chronicles as *subjective* history—history-writing from such standpoints and for such purposes as those mentioned.

The question of scepticism arises once more when Mr Baynes says, of his account of David's conquests (p. 64 sq.), that 'it would not be accepted by most modern scholars . . . I cannot share their doubts' (p. 230). He refers, as an example, to an article of mine where I, in common with others, have preferred to rely upon the more modest account of David's realm in 2 Sam. xxiv 5 sqq. Driver (*Samuel* p. 374) considered Kadesh on the Orontes 'very remote to be mentioned as the N. limit of Israelite territory', and other citations could be made which would show that if Mr Baynes does not share our doubts it would have made for the progress of Biblical studies if he could have considered the reasons advanced in the works to which he refers, and thus enable us to modify, correct, or expunge erroneous or exaggerated arguments. Old Testament criticism is not a party affair. Sceptical, critical, or radical views have before now been destroyed by some better even if more 'conservative' explanation of the data which formed the starting-point: it is the repudiation of critical views without any alternative explanation of the data (here 2 Sam. xxiv 5 sqq.) which it is so disappointing to find in the book before us.

The Books of Kings treat the history of Israel and that of Judah independently, and an examination of the methods of the writers or compilers yields some very interesting results. But we cannot properly understand the inter-relations if we follow in their footsteps, and if, e. g., we sever the reforms in Israel at the rise of Jehu (p. 81) from the corresponding events in Judah (p. 88). We do, indeed, avoid some very serious difficulties by this artificial severance; but of the historical and religious significance of the age we gain a very imperfect view. Mr Baynes does, it is true, take notice of various lesser points in the period of Elijah and Elisha, i. e. before the rise of Jehu; and there is also a reference to Kuenen's view that 2 Kings vi 24–vii 20 belongs after the rise of Jehu and to the reign of Jehoahaz (p. 243). But the essentials are ignored, for, in the words of Harper (*Amos and Hosea* p. xlii), 'who really gathers from the narrative [the whole series is meant] that Elisha lived forty-five years after the revolt of Jehu'. It is a well-supported view (Robertson Smith and others) that the narratives where Elisha is so influential a figure belong to the time of Jehu's dynasty and the wars which *began* in his reign (2 Kings x 32), though they are related before the fall of the house of Omri. This view is far more important than Kuenen's, but even this latter Mr Baynes considers 'misconceived'; and although the reader will believe that he has gained some outline of history, once again it is not that which historical criticism is giving us.

It may be added that the account of the Return from Exile suffers from the slight attention to the evidence of Zechariah which tells against any prior important activity by returned exiles. While finding it 'impossible to question the *general historicity* of the Biblical records', Mr Baynes recognizes in Ezra v 16 'a *diplomatic rewriting* [by the Jews] of their recent history' (p. 119).[1] The two phrases which I have italicized are noteworthy because what is at issue is the meaning to be attached to the former and the extent of the latter. Whatever one's standpoint, this period of the sixth–fifth centuries B.C. is of outstanding interest, and it is a pity that the reader's attention is not drawn to the significance of the mysterious disappearance of Zerubbabel and the appearance a few decades later of a priestly régime (cf. *C. A. H.* iii 412 sq.) What the period means, if we are to have any intelligent understanding of the Old Testament as a whole, is barely if at all indicated, and again there is a gulf between Mr Baynes's historical outline and what lies at the base of much of the critical literature.

---

[1] 'Diplomatic rewriting' is better than 'fabricated' (p. 270 near foot), or the 'pious fraud' which the 'discovery' of Deuteronomy in Josiah's day is not rarely called (cf. p. 254). In point of fact, when we compare Jubilees with Genesis or Chronicles with Samuel-Kings it is evident that rewriting, whether 'diplomatic' or other, was as natural a procedure as those modern compositions which give

How readily what seem to be minor difficulties can be passed over in a popular sketch may be observed in the decisive treatment of the work of Nehemiah *after* the walls of Jerusalem had been rebuilt in fifty-two days. 'Thus protected from hostile intervention, Nehemiah could turn to his social reforms (Neh. v)'; having fortified the city he sought to repeople it (ch. xi), and twelve years later returned to Persia, coming back again for a second time when he carried through his religious reforms (p. 123). This construction is gained by sacrificing Neh. v 14, 16, where the social reforms are apparently in the midst of the hurried rebuilding, and yet Nehemiah looks back upon a twelve years' governorship. No doubt this particular case, taken by itself, seems relatively trifling, but it is connected with other evidence for the very serious opposition to Nehemiah which culminated in certain 'letters' which alarmed the governor (Neh. vi 19). Now the work of criticism is based upon internal details of greater or of less significance; and whereas some scholars will cut the knots by treating inconvenient data as glosses or by throwing them into their waste-paper baskets, others are more concerned with the problems these bring, simply because they conflict with what 'is at first suggested by the Biblical account' (above, p. 171 n.). This is one of the causes of the fundamental differences of opinion that prevail, and although this or the other example of difference of method may seem unimportant, the cumulative effect is vital, if we would understand the developement of the history and religion of Israel. For imperfect views of the history entail imperfect conceptions of the religion of the Old Testament, and therefore of its religious value.

As regards the religion two or three minor details attract attention. It is a little difficult to know why it is said that as part of the religious policy of Manasse (*sic*, Mr Baynes writes Isaia*h*, &c.) 'statues of the horses of Shamash the Sun-god, were erected at the entry of the Temple' (p. 91 sq.). Were not the horses, for which past kings of

well-meaning, though often very erroneous, pictures of the course of the history and religion of Israel.

Judah had been responsible, living horses? 'Josiah put an end to the custom of assigning horses to draw the chariots of the sun in religious processions.'[1] This is what the verse most naturally means; and neither the prophets themselves nor the author of the account of Josiah's reforms were under any illusion as to the evil conditions that prevailed in the national religion. In point of fact, the more frankly we realize what the old religion was, the more impressive becomes the idea we obtain of the achievement of the reforming spirits in Israel. The triad of deities recognized by the Jews at Elephantine in Upper Egypt is of exceptional interest for our knowledge of the religion (p. 287); Mr Baynes has space for Scheftelowitz's blank denial, and since the data have been so frequently and so fully discussed one may venture to suggest that a few lines of argument would have helped the ordinary reader to form an opinion of his own. There is a passing reference to the Semitic goddess Anat (p. 130), and a bibliographical reference to a somewhat speculative article on her (p. 287)—nothing seems to have escaped his bibliographical zeal! But the reader does not learn that Anat(h) was an especially prominent goddess in Syria and Palestine, and he is left to discover for himself that her name enters into Anath-Bethel, the deity closely associated with Yahu in the triad mentioned on the same page.

Attention is drawn to the fact that the view is 'steadily gaining ground that there is no sufficient reason to deny the Mosaic origin of an early form of the Decalogue' (p. 206)—the bibliographical note is invaluable. But there is a vast difference between the unwarrantable denial of such an origin and the difficulty of recovering an early form the origin of which is Mosaic. On the other hand, our ideas of the life and thought in and about the Mosaic age—let us say 1500–1100 B.C.—have been profoundly stirred by external evidence, and the direction in which one is being led is so novel that it is futile to ask whether it is conservative or radical. It has long been realized that writing was then in use, but naturally this does not prove that any of the biblical narratives then existed in writing. On the other hand, the developed conditions reflected in the Amarna Letters would suggest that any 'liturgies and hymns which in a later development were to flower into the Book of Psalms' (p. 52) would go back to hymns to Shamash or Hadad, the great outstanding gods whose importance for the question of Hebrew monotheism should not be ignored. The external evidence allows us to recognize an age of religious activity, if not reform—*here* is the background for the study of the Old Testament (cf. *C. A. H.* ii 403 n.); and the reader who desires an authentic picture of 'Israel among the Nations' must study the history and religion of Israel with a large map—though it may be observed in passing that the map for which the title of the book pleads is wanting.

---

[1] Barnes on 2 Kings xxiii 11 (*Camb. Bible*), cf. Skinner (*Century Bible*), also Kittel *The Religion of the People of Israel* (Eng. transl.) p. 151.

Sooner or later, every serious reader has to take an attitude to the modern study of the Old Testament. Now in the Preface Mr Baynes says, 'writing for English readers, I have used throughout the English forms of Hebrew proper names; thus I have written Jehovah and not Jahveh or Jahweh'. But those who write for English readers also use Yahweh (or the like); and clearly he is not suggesting that the form Jehovah is solely English and unknown elsewhere. There is nothing to shew the reader why the latter form of the Name is considered erroneous, and why—rightly or wrongly—the former spelling is preferred. Nor again, although Mr Baynes has used the 'repellent' symbols, J, E, &c. (p. 193, cf. p. 10), and speaks of the Jahvist and Elohist (pp. 70, 86), does he offer that explanation—and criticism if need be—which would be in place in a text-book. The reader obtains no guidance as to the 'literary analysis of the Pentateuch associated with the name of Wellhausen' (p. 7, the Index gives only one reference to him), although Mr Baynes states that 'in general' he has adopted it as '*a working hypothesis*'. The words are properly italicized, because he goes on to warn us that 'the historical student must at any moment be prepared to abandon it'. He quotes some forceful words of the venerable Earl of Halsbury who, it seems, stated in 1915 that he considered 'the assignment of different fragments of Genesis to a number of wholly imaginary authors great rubbish', and could not understand those 'who base a whole theory of this kind on hypotheses for which there is no evidence whatsoever'. Of course every one knows of remarks some more and some less forceful; but I really find it extremely difficult to understand why Mr Baynes writing for young students and theological colleges should quote such an opinion when he cites in his notes, and sometimes with very high praise (e.g. p. 183 sq.), works which are written throughout from a standpoint in the value and validity of which he evidently has so little confidence.

When one has studied the history of biblical criticism and the data on which it is founded, when one has traced the genetic continuity in its developement, and has marked the nature of the mistakes that have been made—often extremely instructive ones—and when one has realized the fundamental weakness of the opponents, the notion of abandonment 'at any moment' is misleading. Not in this way has the history of research proceeded. The 'working hypothesis' answers great masses of facts, it has opened a way to further progressive study, and it has not as yet been faced by any rival hypothesis. One must sincerely regret the line taken by Mr Baynes in his Preface. To be sure, Old Testament criticism is at a transitional stage, very conservative and reactionary tendencies are to the fore. But those who know the real value of some of the most vigorous attacks—Mr Baynes mentions the late Prof. Naville—and the slight extent to which even the more striking attacks of Prof. Welch affect the main position of the literary hypothesis, will not share his doubts.[1] It is the bibliographer who, not unnaturally, is swayed by the conflicting tendencies in Old Testament research, and feeling himself standing on shaky, if not unfamiliar, ground, safeguards himself in his Preface. One reads his admirable bibliographical notes, with their information on rival explanations or contending views; one turns to *Israel amongst the Nations* and sees through what omissions his sketch has been constructed; finally, one reads his Preface with its reference to the working-hypothesis which has made so profound a difference between the Old Testament study of the last fifty years and all that preceded it. One feels that Mr Baynes has gone out of his way to cite the more than unfavourable verdict of an eminent legal light accustomed to handle evidence—a verdict obviously the more weighty on that account. That the book has very many merits and that scholars will welcome the notes there can be no doubt; but when a writer appears to have no convictions that call for courage, one wonders whether the Preface renders a service to the young students for whom it is intended.

Speaking quite generally, one cannot but contrast the superficiality of modern reactionary and ultra-conservative tendencies opposed to progressive criticism with the massiveness of the work of Wellhausen and Kuenen, of Robertson Smith and Driver, and others responsible for the great forward steps in criticism. Nay more, this superficiality stands in most striking contrast even to some of the earlier books written along anti-critical lines—e. g. by Orr, who seems to be cited only once, and by J. Robertson, who does not seem to be named at all. Such writers (see further *Camb. Anc. Hist.* ii 667 foot), even though one disagrees with them, can be read and re-read with profit; and it is really regrettable that modern works, which in attacking critical views might force a further progressive developement, are usually so weak and ill-equipped. In the interests of biblical research this is much to be deplored, for Old Testament criticism is a discipline, and its opponents should make some effort to understand the standpoint which either they repudiate or which they have picked up, prepared to drop at any moment whenever the wind freshens.

---

[1] On Prof. Naville's attacks reference may be made to *J. T. S.* xxv (1924) pp. 432 sqq. As regards Prof. Welch, see *J. T. S.* xxvi 162 sqq., where a distinction is drawn between his recognition of the late date of Deuteronomy and of the post-exilic date of P *in their present form* and, on the other hand, his arguments for the antiquity of the material they embody.

In the book before us the weight is laid upon the historical rather than the religious aspect of the Old Testament. But, as Dean Stanley declared, 'Whatever is true History teaches true Religion'. The historical and the religious aspects cannot be kept entirely apart, and such questions as these naturally arise: Does one's personal religion necessarily imply or demand what might be called a traditionalist or markedly conservative view of the Old Testament? and Does one's view of the history of Israel allow an adequate conception of the religious value of the Old Testament? Now, there are many who are hurt by the destructive or negative views of critics moderate or advanced, and in this age of unrest it is entirely natural that they should desire to concentrate upon the *religious* meaning rather than the historical criticism of the Old Testament. To a certain extent the present conservative or reactionary tendencies appear to be due, not so much to any careful and unprejudiced study of the details of biblical criticism as to the conviction that the Old Testament as interpreted even by 'moderate' scholars has not the spiritual force of the Old Testament of pre-critical days. Rightly or wrongly I am tempted to believe that it is the inadequacy of Old Testament criticism for the *religious* consciousness which accounts for much confused argument of the day. It is true that one encounters men competent as historians in other fields, or archaeologists, or travellers who have visited Abraham's birthplace, or can endorse the military accuracy of the Book of Joshua; and they will oppose various critical views. But it is perhaps legitimate to distinguish between them, unaware as they not rarely prove to be of the more intricate details upon which criticism rests, and those to whom the religious or spiritual weakness of modern critical literature is the gravest stumbling-block; and these one cannot approach save with sympathy.

Old Testament research is becoming increasingly psychological. Instead of the enquiry into literary and historical questions, the aim then is to determine what this or the other statement meant for the Israelite. In co-ordinating its meaning for him and its meaning for us we are approaching that standpoint of past generations where the religious meaning of a narrative made an immediate appeal to the ordinary reader. In understanding the subjective and psychological value of any narrative, belief, &c., for the Israelite, we are finding a new, real, and immediate value for ourselves. This step is, of course, no novel one—that criticism has removed certain 'difficulties', and has given a new religious value to the Old Testament, is a common experience. But the trend to which I refer seems to be becoming more definite, with the result that the gulf between the Bible of the ordinary simple religious soul and that of the critic will be lessened. This will make the task of criticism more delicate, for in restating the psychological and spiritual value of some narrative or belief, we may expect the old religious meaning to come to the front but in a new form ; and what may seem a conservative tendency in one direction—and a very vital one, namely, the restatement of religious truth—will not be reactionary because the old ideas will be in a new framework of history, the work of criticism will have been taken into account and not ignored. Both psychology and archaeology often seem to encourage conservative tendencies, and veritable reactionary tendencies harmful to the growth of knowledge are likely to increase.

As one example of the significance of even very advanced criticism I would point to the Pentateuch and the religious value of the story of the Exodus and Conquest to those who adopted a whole-hearted thorough-going traditionalist attitude. The lessons that have been drawn are familiar. On the other hand, what modern criticism can draw from it can be seen in the commentaries.[1] But even when one goes farther and adopts a much more advanced critical standpoint and, when one regards, as I would, even the older sources J and E as exilic *in their present form*, the religious value is actually heightened. The Pentateuch can be used, more or less as a whole, to illustrate the exilic and early post-exilic ages. The religious value of the Exodus and Conquest is, then, no longer that of *actual historical* events of distant pre-Davidic times ; nor is it distributed somewhat intermittently and disconnectedly over a number of centuries, according to the current dates of J, E, D, P ; but the ideas illustrate the internal vicissitudes and developements of Israel when she was undergoing reconstruction in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. There is a new historical framework, and the religious and historical aspects again converge. The old traditions of an escape from bondage and an entry into a Promised Land become, on this theory, the symbols of the transition from an old era to a new one and the discipline of people and leaders. A people are passing from one epoch to another—to a 'Promised Land'.

The essential unity which the traditionalist maintained is thus retained, though admittedly at a very late age ;[2] and the most essential truths admit of being worked into the actual history of a period which is far more important for one's conception of human developement.[3]

---

[1] See, e.g., McNeile *Exodus*, Introduction, pp. cxix sqq.

[2] See the interesting observations of the late Dr James Orr (*op. cit.* p. 527) on theories of a 'practical contemporaneousness' of authorship, or a 'simultaneous working together' of the documents.

[3] I have ventured to cite this inasmuch as Mr Baynes—throughout generous to

In all great history, in the dramatic inter-relation of stages of history and of teaching as set forth in the Bible there is something that is more than 'sacred'; and the present fundamentalist, ultra-conservative, and reactionary tendencies, in so far as they betoken the effort to preserve this—may I say?—'sacramental' value of the Bible, may be regarded as a call to Old Testament scholars to determine whether scholarship has completed its task of restoring the profound spiritual meaning which the Bible has had in history and which has so powerfully influenced the course of history. The more technical arguments and objections to criticism, as I have attempted to indicate, will be met technically; and those who propose to deal more particularly with the historical aspects must realize the technical nature of the study. But to the other objections the reply will be that through the progress of criticism the Old Testament is having an increasingly spiritual value, one surely not less than what it had in the past. Criticism and—be it noted—external evidence in particular are giving us a much more impressive conviction of the Divine Process ruling in universal history, and though progressive criticism may seem to be moving ever farther away from the old traditional position, the spiritual values of the Old Testament are being reinterpreted and restated in a more significant form.

That there is a price to pay must be recognized. Already I have endeavoured to point out at what cost the readable sketch in *Israel amongst the Nations* has been achieved. Needless to add, what has been said does not refer to this book alone. The ordinary reader, wearied if not repelled by lengthy discussions or by inconclusive results, and unable to pick out the new facts which prove to be vital, is scarcely aware of the forceful methods more or less unconsciously adopted by those writers whose simple and straightforward narratives are often so reassuring. Who troubles, in such cases, to consider the really drastic implications of some seemingly moderate or conservative sketch of the events? Who goes beneath the surface and sees how writers have filled their waste-paper baskets with the inconvenient and contradictory data which would embarrass a simple story? The ordinary reader does not realize the drastic methods that are—and must be—adopted in order to present an easy, intelligible narrative of the history and religion of Israel. He is unconscious of the sacrifice. Along such lines would run the reply which progressive Old Testament criticism would make to its antagonists. On the one hand is the

---

those from whom he probably differs most—has done me the honour of referring to my article 'Pentateuch' in the new edition of Chambers's *Encyclopaedia* (p. 310), where I have endeavoured to place the Pentateuch on the background of those great social, political, and religious changes in the middle of the first millennium B.C. which mark a new era in universal history.

price unconsciously paid by those who have found in some 'conservative' or 'moderate' reconstruction the religious values which they cherish; and on the other is a shifting of the historical perspective, the transference of attention from one series of events formerly taken to be literally true to another series which mark a great creative epoch, and the placing of the drama of Israel in the grand developement of history and religion.

The Old Testament is being placed upon the background of our knowledge of the ancient East and of ancient religion. We are gaining truer conceptions of 'Israel among the Nations', and the religious and spiritual value of the Old Testament is being interwoven with knowledge more authentic than that of the traditionalist and extreme conservative. The Old Testament, once an integral part of the thought of the day, is being organically bound up with new positive knowledge and progressive methods of study. Its sacred, its sacramental value, is not one that stands out of relation to ordinary knowledge and is preserved only by being left untouched; on the contrary, it becomes more wonderful—more transcendent, one might say—in proportion as the criticism of the Old Testament comes into line with the forward movements in the study of archaeology and ancient history, of sociology, psychology, and comparative religion.

Whether the differing tendencies in Old Testament research will become more obvious and the lines of cleavage more marked, time will show. Here one word alone needs to be said. We are often tempted to contrast 'extreme' tendencies—to the Left and to the Right—and we assume that Truth lies between the two, in a mediating moderate position, in some genial compromise. But we also speak of 'flying off at a tangent'; and, we may ask, What is the course of research that proceeds otherwise? It may often seem that the curve of advanced criticism is taking one ever farther away from the starting-point; but it may be that the straightest line in the world of thought is a curve. For though we do not return ultimately to our original starting-point, we may be tending towards a position which in fullness and richness approximates it more truly than those positions through which the path of criticism has lain. Here would be no return to the old—that were veritable reaction—but the old would reappear in a new form with a pregnancy and driving power for which past history furnishes inspiring parallels. For Old Testament criticism will be fulfilling itself when it shall have passed from the rebirth and reconstruction of the religion of Israel—amid the reaction and decay that mark the surrounding Oriental powers—to the *complete* reinterpretation and restatement of the religious value of the Old Testament itself (cf. *Camb. Anc. Hist.* iii 500).

S. A. Cook.

Essays in Philosophy, by JAMES WARD, late Professor of Mental Philosophy at Cambridge, F.B.A., &c.: *with a Memoir of the Author* by OLWEN WARD CAMPBELL. (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1927.)

DR WARD has been happily provided with his biographer in a daughter who has inherited his own versatility and width of intellectual interest, and is also endowed with literary talents of high order. Mrs Campbell seeks not so much to deal with her father's philosophical work, as to narrate his life and to portray his personality; and for her memoir, which is a masterpiece in biographical literature, and which occupies about a hundred pages of this volume, all readers and disciples of the great teacher will owe her gratitude. To many of such persons, knowing little about Ward's life before its academic period, the history of his earlier years will be surprising, and will perhaps at times make even distressing reading. As Mrs Campbell says, his 'is one of those lives which are of interest to every adventurous spirit because they are in essence a voyage of discovery, where the traveller sets out with no other guide than the pointing compass of his own soul, for an unknown land, and after many conflicts, obstacles, and inevitable losses, arrives at his goal'.

Of the dozen essays contained in this collection, the majority have been published before; students of philosophy, sensible of the weightiness of practically everything that Dr Ward wrote, will therefore have unearthed these already. Some, however, appear now in print for the first time. The selection, following lines laid down by the author, has been made by Professors Sorley and Stout, to whom, for their editorial labour, our thanks are due. One gathers from their Preface that no more of the literary remains of Dr Ward are to receive publication, although he left masses of notes for courses of lectures, and sometimes the spoken word was taken down by students. I have been informed that the course of lectures on the theory of knowledge, repeatedly delivered, was not only taken down in shorthand but also type-written; and I had therefore indulged the hope that this valuable matter might yet be given forth in a book. But if one is saddened by the thought of the student's loss involved in the non-emergence of this material, which he would be grateful to have in any state of disorderedness, one cannot, of course, but approve the decision of the literary executors, responsible only to the deceased author, when they tell us that 'it is doubtful whether any one but the author himself could have worked up the result into a book which would have satisfied him'.

Five of the essays before us hang together, in that their titles indicate that they are concerned with philosophy in general or as a whole; its progress, its difficulties, its present trend, its orientation and relation to scientific standpoints, and so forth. My separation of these is arbitrary, and of no significance other than of convenience.

In the first essay of this group, Dr Ward compares the advance of philosophy with that of science, and shews that the assertion that philosophy has made no progress such as science can claim, is partly untrue, partly unfair and unintelligent. In the next, attention is called especially to a fundamental difficulty intrinsic to philosophy, viz. the fact that its basic concepts involve one another, or are mutually implicated. They are not, and cannot be, in the technical sense, distinct (i. e. isolable, free from mutual involution, rather than clear). Hence the logico-mathematical procedure, the method of linear progress, of 'divide and conquer' or 'one thing at a time', however possible in mathematics and theoretical science, is precluded from philosophy. If, for instance, we try to isolate the conceptions of substance and cause, they but suffer evaporation into abstractions no longer serviceable for thought about actuality. Thus the great speculative ontologists who ambitiously used this kind of method—Plato, Descartes, Spinoza, Hegel—were seers in an ideational realm, rather than solvers of actual problems. This essay, hitherto unpublished, contains perhaps more matter that is not discussed in the author's books than any of the group; and I should place it first amongst the five in importance and value.

The address on the present trend of philosophical speculation is interesting, chiefly on account of its comments and criticism on contemporary literature: that is to say, on works dating from about the beginning of this century. One could only wish that it had run to considerably greater length; for it passes so quickly from topic to topic as to be almost scrappy. The lecture following it, on orientation, is a condensation of an important portion of the argument against naturalism, presented in the first series of Gifford Lectures: this will be welcomed by readers of that large work who found its scientific detail and technicalities formidable. Lastly comes 'An introduction to philosophy': a critical and succinct statement of such lines of doctrine and method, in Plato and Aristotle, as were most largely determinative of subsequent philosophizing, and of the relations of their philosophy to mathematics, logic, science, and 'history'. There is almost as much of Ward in it, and of Ward at his best, as of the ancient Greeks.

After the essays which announce themselves to be concerned with philosophy as a whole, is placed the Adamson Lecture on 'mechanism and morals'. It does not treat of ethics, as its title might suggest, but rather of the 'historical'; by which the author means conscious agents and their deeds, as distinguished from the phenomenal things, of which Empirical Science discovers the laws, for theoretical science to interpret in terms of mechanism. Like the essay on Orientation, this discourse traverses ground covered in the Gifford Lectures, and is similarly valuable, as containing a variant of part of the argument of those works. It argues that matter and mechanism cannot explain life and mind, whereas the physical and mechanically describable can be explained in terms of spiritual monads or of pampsychism. Dr Ward had a great reverence for what he often calls 'the principle' of continuity, sometimes seeming to overlook that, when extended beyond the limits of empirical observation, the 'principle' expresses but a pious hope. Hence, partly, his intolerance of dualism, the necessity to eliminate which, in the interests of theism, he perhaps exaggerated. But in arguing that unmitigated spiritualism is a *possible* ontology, he was within his rights as an empiricist: i.e. as one who sets out from facts and tests theory by application to facts. He elsewhere argues (persuasively, as it seems to me) that spiritualism has the advantage over dualism, when the rival theories are applied to solve the problem of body and mind; and if we accept that superiority as proved, we may claim that spiritualism, involving 'contingency everywhere', is adequate also to the further particular but large problem of biological heredity. For, in the next essay of this volume, Dr Ward submits strong scientific reasons for believing that 'the secret of heredity is to be found in the facts of memory', and so is to be explained in terms of psychology, rather than in terms of mechanical laws.

The ninth essay is a presidential address to the Aristotelian Society. In subject-matter it is closely related with some of the preceding five contiguous essays on philosophy; for it begins as a discourse on the method of philosophy, and, passing on to deal with contemporary thought, ends in a criticism of neo-Hegelian Absolutism. Philosophy, it is argued, cannot begin at the beginning; its method must be 'inverse', from the posterior to the logically and ontally prior. From Plato down to Bradley and Bosanquet, many of the greatest constructive philosophers have begun from a standpoint 'which only a completed philosophy would occupy': and with general consent they are held hitherto to have failed. They have inevitably shewn lack of continuity and coherence, and so have produced what Kant stigmatized as philosophical rhapsodizing. Philosophy can never be complete; the most it can do, is to advance continuously and tentatively, and be coherent. Aristotle, almost at the beginning of the history of philosophy, obtained a glimpse of the only right method, but turned away from it; Kant obtained more than a glimpse and, though to a much smaller extent, also turned away, thereby preparing for absolute idealism

Ward himself seems to me to deserve a place in future histories of philosophy—apart from his pre-eminence as a psychologist, and quite independently of how his particular conclusions may stand the test of time—because, in fuller measure than any other individual teacher, he has employed, without wavering or desertion, the very uncommon method in philosophy, which he himself regards as the only one open to us, if philosophy is to be *truth valid of actuality*. In other words, he is a pioneer in an empiricism that has as little in common with what is historically associated with that name, as with *a priori* rationalism. If any accusation of wavering, or desertion of his principle or method, can be brought against him, by one who would use it with rigorous consistency and radicalness, it is at one point only; one which does not affect the coherence of what may be called his system, and one as to which perhaps he has not expressed himself fully enough to allow the critic to urge the charge with confidence. What I here refer to, is Ward's attitude, or rather hints as to an attitude that possibly was his, towards 'necessary truth' of logic, mathematics, and axiology, which, in his other recently published posthumous work, he asserts to be none the less 'necessary' and applicable to all possible worlds, though its realization depends on actuality. He carefully distinguishes between what he sometimes calls 'truth', and 'validity', respectively; but one can conceive a critic asking if there is not an element of contingency in these so-called necessary truths, in that the entities they are concerned with owe their forthcomingness—what some would call their 'existence' —to postulation and, therefore, to actual willing. If so, does not such voluntarism as Ward professed, for once give place to Platonism?

But this is a digression from the volume before us. Returning to it, we find next an address on Einstein and Epistemology. With the theory of relativity, as presented by mathematical physicists who abstain from metaphysics, or as a further stage in the economical 'description' which Ward took theoretical physics to be, he of course has no quarrel. As an attempt to attain, through the relative, an understanding of the absolute, or as metaphysically expounded by Prof. Eddington and others, it can be condemned by the epistemologist, to whom knowledge of the theory of tensors is superfluous, as false in method and unproductive of knowledge or understanding. This address is aptly placed in the volume by the editors. As a criticism of the latest absolutism in physics, it follows well on a lecture scrutinizing recent absolutism in mental philosophy; while, as indicating the role of Prof. Eddington's version of the relativity-theory in emphasizing the subjective or anthropic element in knowledge, it leads on to the study of Kant which succeeds it. For *one* of the features of Kant's philosophy as a whole, to which Ward has especially called attention, is its explicit and implicit insistence on the anthropic, or ejective and interpretative, factor in knowledge of the world, not to say in theology; and it is one of supreme importance, not merely for understanding Kant, but also for ascertaining the nature of knowledge and its relation to faith. The essay entitled 'Immanuel Kant' is masterly, if only in respect of its condensedness and its apparent immediate penetration at all points to the essential pith. On this account, no more shall be said of it than a word of encouragement to students who have found Ward's small book on Kant difficult, because of its compression and conciseness: and that is, that the yet further degree of condensation, achieved in this essay, has brought to myself increased clarification, rather than presented more of incomprehensibility.

There remain two essays to be mentioned, the first in the volume, entitled 'Can faith remove mountains?', and the last, on 'The Christian ideas of faith and eternal life'. By 'faith' the author here means *fiducia* or trust in ideal objects created by ideation and 'realized', not in the sense of actualized—as is a machine by its inventor—but as pragmatically found to minister to the spiritual life. As the world of science is beyond the reach of the brute, but nevertheless exists, so the kingdom of heaven, opened out in 'God-consciousness' but beyond the cognitive powers of the naturalist, may be reality of higher order than the world in space and time.

There can be reasonable faith in such alleged reality, though no knowledge of it. The faith-element involved in all knowledge of actuality might perhaps with advantage have been indicated more fully in this connexion; as it is, the appearance is given of a sharper antithesis between faith and knowledge than really obtains. Similarly, it might have saved possible misconception, if, in the discussion of eternal life, Prof. Ward had not so severely isolated the hold on eternity from all association with the hope of immortality. He took the Christian conception of the eternal to have no reference to time or to timelessness, but to be purely a value-concept which should—I suppose—have had as much practical significance for the first Christians, if they had been 'of all men most miserable'. A large part of the final essay is digression into an indictment of ecclesiastical corruption of essential Christianity. One may be in sympathy with Dr Ward's charges, yet call them trite, and surmise that the occasion of addressing a theological society was used as an opportunity to get them off his chest.

The volume, as a whole, is a supplement to the author's previous works that no one, who values them, can afford to be without. The essays were written at dates ranging between 1879 and 1924; yet not only do they form a connected whole: they illustrate the continuity and coherence of Dr Ward's philosophy.

Faith and Reason in Religion, by GEORGE GALLOWAY, D.Phil., D.D. (London, Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1927.)

SERIOUS students of philosophical theology will welcome another book from the learned and thoughtful author of *Principles of Religious Developement*, *Religion and Modern Thought*, &c. It is to be hoped that Dr Galloway will be prevailed upon to present us with the unified outcome of his matured thought, in a series of Gifford Lectures. Meanwhile we have been given a new instalment, in a collection of essays on more or less connected subjects. The title of the book indicates the binding thread, and the first lecture is directly concerned with knowledge (or reason) and faith.

A short account of the historical developement of the contrast of faith and knowledge serves incidentally to shew that 'faith' and 'reason' both bear a variety of meanings, with different theologians and philosophers. It seems to me that the disentangling of these meanings, and the psychological analysis of the several functions that have been called by the names faith and reason, is a step that needs to be taken, before their relations can be further studied. This is done to some extent by the author, in the case of faith. Dr Galloway indicates the difference between faith, as the assurance of things hoped for, and belief (which is often called faith) as holding true on satisfactory evidence, or as opining. And certainly, as thus described, faith and belief differ. Yet even in faith as described in the Epistle to the Hebrews—described as broader than religious faith, yet not broadly enough, because the description only applies to *successful* ventures—there is, besides motivation by feeling or value, the equally essential element, cognitive rather than conative, of ideation or creative imagination. There is also so much of belief as is involved in taking the ideational object for a reality, though as yet without satisfactory evidence. This done, the attitude of trust toward the object, the *fiducia* which is also called faith, but which presupposes the acts just described (for which perhaps the name *fides* might be utilized), becomes possible. It is not the author's purpose, here, to pursue analysis to the farthest limit to which it can be prosecuted, and he has supplied as clear an account of faith as is practicable in the absence of such completed analysis. More of loss is incurred, however, through the author's abstention from applying to reason, even so much of sifting as he has devoted to faith. The consequence is that he seems not to use this term, of many meanings, in one and the same sense throughout his book. Dr Galloway is content to draw no hard distinction between reason and knowledge, and to adopt as convenient Kant's technical use of 'reason' as distinguished from that of 'understanding'. But if the vagueness attending the former of these decisions is without pernicious effect on his exposition, some advantage, accruing to theology from a recognition of the arbitrariness of Kant's distinction, is forfeited by the latter of these conventions. Moreover Kant's reason is (for him) *not* knowledge, and is (at least for us) broadly identical with faith; while cognition-attitude towards the noumenal, whose *that* Kant affirmed while denying knowledge as to its *what*, belongs to knowledge, rather than to what can be called faith.

The second lecture is on the genesis and the truth, taken in connexion, of religious beliefs. The general issue as to how far, if at all, genesis bears on *knowable* validity, is not discussed, though we should like to know Dr Galloway's views on it. Some pages are devoted to critical examination of theories as to the nature, origin, and developement of religion: a subject on which we have already learned that Dr Galloway is a learned and judicious guide. While agreeing with the main trend of this essay and with its argumentation as a whole, I wonder if, here and there, retrospective interpretation of data, from the point of view of theism established, is not allowed to take the place of argument for theism, to which we are still on the way out. Thus we are told (p. 91) that the issue of religious criticism of religious beliefs in a process of developement [progress?] seems impossible, 'unless the movement were guided by some growing vision of the Divine'. As part of a cumulative argument for theism, as a possible, and even as the most reasonable, interpretation of things, no doubt this suggestion carries weight; but it would be a renouncing of the 'natural' kind of explanation, such as is by no means exclusive of the 'supernatural' kind, if it were intended to imply that here psychological, and atheously describable, causation were impossible. Again, I cannot assimilate the statement (p. 93) that a value that is to work must have some living relation to reality. It is ambiguous. 'Reality' may here refer to God or other objects of religious belief, which is the reference intended or desiderated; it may also refer to actual conduct and its environment, which is the reference that indubitably obtains. Unfortunately for pragmatist arguments of this over-direct kind, it is fact that existential beliefs, provided they are held with personal convincedness, may be valuable, in the sense of promoting edification of life and character, and yet be erroneous as to their existential import. The ambiguity in question is resolved, when (p. 101) comparison is drawn between the working (in conduct), that can be ascribed to a religious belief, and the working (in colligating phenomena), that is possessed by a scientific hypothesis; but it would seem that the parallel wanted is not that of a hypothesis that descriptively colligates phenomena, but that of a proposition about ontal realities. As is said a few lines farther on, 'in goodness lies man's affinity with that transcendent Good we name God'; but this is as yet the *demonstrandum*, and needs to be somehow reached, before the pragmatist's assertion, purporting to be demonstrating, can be justified. These, however, are details of little significance for the argument as a whole; unless perchance they be straws indicating the difficulty which even the strenuous thinker may encounter, in ascertaining at precisely what level of his knowledge-organization he will allow entrance to the pragmatic element, which even science cannot wholly strain out of its foundations.

The third lecture deals with the finality of the Christian religion, considered in connexion with developement in religion and doctrine. Some modernists, Troeltsch, and other writers on the subject, are discussed; and the author concludes that in Christianity, as a peculiar or individual form of ethical theism, there is a transcendent or absolute element, though this cannot be proved by any historical, scientific, or philosophical method. 'The attempt to give a rational proof of the finality of the Christian religion', runs the last sentence of the essay, 'will always fail, just because it is faith not reason which gains that experience of value on which the assurance of finality rests.' 'Reason' would seem to carry here a narrower, or more logically 'rational', sense than that which it has previously borne for the author. But my main unfulfilled desideratum with regard to this lecture is information as to what precisely is intended to be understood by 'the Christian religion'. Is it the personal religion of Jesus, or that and something more, and if so, how much more? In one of Ward's recently published essays occurs an interesting expression of opinion as to the finality of Christianity, in the first of these senses. Ward cites Goethe's saying, 'Let the human mind expand as much as it will, beyond the grandeur and moral elevation of Christianity, as it sparkles and shines in the Gospels, beyond that, the human mind will not advance'. He then adds, 'I would say need not advance'; agreeing here with Martineau that 'Christianity, understood as the personal religion of Jesus Christ, stands clear of all perishable elements and realizes the true relation between man and God'. Whether Dr Galloway would be content with this attitude seems doubtful.

In treating of history and its religious interpretation, the author rejects the view that human progress is necessary or is a divine law of history, and maintains that the ultimate *raison d'être* of social developement is the subserving of personal developement. He has discussed the philosophy of history at greater length elsewhere. Here he chiefly pleads again for the idea of an ever-present kingdom in which every striving spirit comes to its completion, early and late actors in the play enjoying the same spiritual heritage, so that every point in history is charged with religious meaning, and the past is not mere means to a far-off event; and, once more, it is faith, not reason, on which he relies.

Grace and Freedom is the subject of the next discourse. It is argued with lucidity and reasonableness that between grace and freedom there is no antithesis, while no success has attended the neo-Hegelian attempt to synthesize, by obliteration of distinctions, these factors in some fundamental unity. With the exception of a wise address on the study of theology in connexion with ministerial work, on which I will not touch, the last lecture of the series is one on Butler as an apologist. Dr Galloway is sympathetic and very fair to Butler; and the few criticisms that he passes on *The Analogy* are justifiable. There is one point, however, in this connexion, on which comment may be offered. It is remarked (p. 197) that it is in his sober balancing of probabilities that the modern man finds Butler least convincing; 'in a time of buoyant faith ... the notion that the religious man must base his life on probabilities ... would never be taken seriously.' It makes all the difference here, whether one means probabilities, from the standpoint of the experience which the individual believer is 'enjoying', i. e. probabilities accounted such by the believer himself, or probabilities that (whatever the individual takes them to be) are such, from the point of view of reflective knowledge or common science. The 'full assurance of faith' indeed transcends, as Dr Galloway says, the realm of probabilities; provided 'probability' is interpreted from the former of the standpoints just distinguished: not necessarily, if we interpret from the latter standpoint. Now, though Butler may not have recognized any such distinction, and may therefore incur in some measure the criticism that is passed upon him, it is natural to suppose that he was a sharer of Locke's doctrine, that what we commonly call knowledge, e. g. natural science, is 'probable belief'; and it is then possible to regard him as, in the field of theology, a better Lockean than Locke. Thus, 'probability is the guide of life', or 'theology is probable belief'—which is practically the same as 'theology rests on faith'—is an utterance the pregnancy of which in import is far more appreciable to us, in the light of recent inductive logic, than it could have been for Butler. Full assurance of faith is individual certitude-feeling; Butler's probability is public science renouncing logical certainty. How theologians of the nineteenth century went astray, either by confounding these things or by assuming them to be mutually exclusive, we are now realizing.

An Experiment with Time, by J. W. DUNNE. (London, A. & C. Black, Ltd., 1927.)

ON the strength of fragments of dream-experience and also of waking experience, and of experiments connected therewith, the author of this well-written and entertaining book suggests that the human mind possesses some faculty of foresight. The remarkable facts which he reports will doubtless be sifted by psychologists; meanwhile, wonderful as the experiences may seem in their unsifted state, their sporadic appearance scarcely justifies the hasty conclusion, expressed in some press notices of Mr Dunne's book, that 'an extraordinary faculty of the widest philosophical implication' has been discovered. If dreams contain 'images' of future events, it follows that the future is real or existent, in the same sense as is the past: that there is no becoming, or making of history. So the author elaborates a theory of time, in order metaphysically to interpret the data of his abnormal experience. Time is serial, in the sense that flow or passage of time implies another order of time, and so on; in other words, the dogma, that time knows but one dimension, is repudiated. If I understand the author rightly, his argument derives its force from an initial hypostatization of a subsistent relation into an existent term, and the figurative expression 'time passes' is literalized. Serial time involves a serial observer: and at this stage of the argument I suspect confusion of the field of an individual experient's consciousness with that of common experience, conceptually elaborated from the plurality of individual fields, called by common sense 'real', and regarded as moving independently of any individual's attention which 'follows' it. The later direct proof, by the analytic method, of the 'serialism' of the conscious observer involves the preliminary dogma that there can be no consciousness without consciousness of it: and this is regarded by psychologists in general as a gratuitous assumption. Whether these errors radically vitiate the whole of the argumentation in which they are embodied, I cannot say, because I am unable to translate the author's thought in terms of my own apperceptive system: and that may be but my own defect. But those theologians who are able to follow where, I confess, I cannot, will perhaps be interested by the theological applications of which the author's results admit. 'Serialism', we are told, discloses the existence of a soul which has a definite beginning in absolute time, with immortality in other dimensions of time; and also the existence of a superlative observer, possessing many of the capacities and functions which the theist assigns to God.

Purposive Evolution, by EDMUND NOBLE. (London, George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1927.)

THE purposiveness of Nature that is discussed, in this volume, with scientific learning and wealth of quotation, with comprehensiveness and in detail, in eloquent and dignified style, is not what 'purposiveness' means, but might, with more propriety and regard for established meanings, be called non-purposiveness. It is not identical or coextensive with internal teleology, the striving for self-betterment which is attributed to organisms; nor with the external or transcendent teleology invoked by the theist. It is rather the *Zweckmässigkeit*, as contrasted with *Absichtlichkeit*, that only implies adaptedness in things, and conceivably may find explanation, such as Kant sought, otherwise than in terms of the category of end. Indeed it is regarded by the author as the outcome of unintelligent 'force'. The emergence of adaptation suggestive of purpose is, of course, then left an enexplained mystery. Contrivance or design in Nature, we are told (p. 524), 'is the elementary form of the end-reaching we witness and practise in our lives as organisms. Out of a process which has endurance for its goal emerges in both living and not-living the intelligence of "intelligent" adaptations. In accepting this view we deliver purposiveness from its supposed origin in psychic elements; the notion of a cosmos ruled by mind widens out into the thought of a cosmos potential of mind . . .; the appeal to the argument from [*sic*] design yields to the argument from the nature of power.' The 'ancient thought of conscious design' is rejected (p. 525) 'for the conception of an omnipresent primordial intelligence identical with things'.

These citations so speak for themselves as to need no comment. And they are typical illustrations of the author's habit of mind. Indeed the *generatio aequivoca* and 'the naturalist's fallacy' are favourite instruments in these chapters. Thus it is said (p. 531) that 'any worthy view of the cosmos process requires us to reverse the procedure of subjectivism by using for the interpretation of Nature not the superficial characters of life, but rather the fundamental characters of universe power'; and it is argued (p. 533) that inasmuch as 'such personality as we know rests on a foundation of impersonal characters neither consciously originated nor consciously directed', the voluntary activities of the organism are determined by the properties of matter. Thought that is so 'comprehensive' as to identify heights with depths, fruits with roots, the emergent with the 'superficial', and so levelling as to obliterate the difference between intelligence and unintelligent things, and to absorb the category of end into that of unconscious cause, can hardly illumine cosmic problems: to blur vital distinctions does but reinstate pre-scientific nebulosity.

To attribute the adaptedness of the world to a potency for adaptiveness does not solve, but only restates, the problem set by the facts of adaptation and of progress. Teleology, invoking purposiveness proper, whether it be a true or a false explanation, at any rate explains. And it is belated to decry it as subjective or anthropomorphic, now that we know the category of cause or power to have the self-same origination as that of end, and to know none but the pragmatic justification obtainable by any 'regulative' concept.

First Steps in the Philosophy of Religion, by CHARLES HARRIS, D.D. (London, Student Christian Movement, 1927.)

NOT even first steps *in* philosophy of religion can be securely, or even intelligently, taken until previous steps have been made in psychology, theory of knowledge, &c. Consequently this little book, from the academic, or the teacher's, point of view, must needs be unsatisfactory, because tending to foster superficiality. It might none the less possess merits as apologetic or missionary propaganda. However, I doubt whether it will be found convincing by present-day pupils who, so far as my experience goes, are before all things critical, curious, and unprepared to accept teaching without due reasons and full reckoning with alternative views. The book is reactionary; and some of its fundamental doctrines are not only abandoned by philosophical theologians of the highest order, but are also likely to present burdens or difficulties to inquiring and up-to-date minds. For instance, the concept of God that is offered, is that of the infinite and 'necessary' Being; and the arguments for theism that are, at least mainly, relied upon, are the old traditional 'proofs'. The student is told (p. 8) that Kant's 'attempted disproof of the arguments for Theism' was found by Hegel to be fallacious, and the traditional 'proofs' to require only a certain amount of adaptation and restatement to render them 'as effective as ever': also that it seems likely that Hegel's point of view will in the end prevail, though it is admitted that at present 'critical' views of the Kantian type are in the ascendant. Be this (abridged) quotation misleading or not, its last clause is both true and candid. But the reader must be docile indeed, who, after weighing it and without further shewing, will be led to believe Kant's criticism to be negligible; and, if he has learned anything about Hegel, he will wonder whether that philosopher's adaptations and restatements really serve the interests of theism. Little or no notice is taken of theistic arguments that dispense with the old 'proofs'; though one would have thought that such arguments would possess more persuasive power at the present time. And much (e. g. the Kantian *a priori* factor in knowledge) is taken for unassailable truth, that is disputable and actually disputed by the greatest of teachers. The book, in fact, is not an introduction to theological philosophy as a pursuit, so much as an advocacy and an exposition of conclusions reached or presupposed. The list of works recommended, on its last page, for aiding further study of philosophy of religion is a curious medley, as remarkable for omissions of much that is masterly and classical as for inclusion of the mediocre.

F. R. TENNANT.

Christliche Dogmatik, by Prof. R. SEEBERG. (Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, Vol. I, 1924, Vol. II, 1925.)

IN 1928 Prof. Seeberg will complete the thirtieth year of his theological teaching at the University of Berlin. Some of his shorter works have been translated into English, such as *The Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion* and *Text-book of the History of Doctrines*. But these last two volumes sum up and elaborate the results of his previous studies. Within the limits of a brief review, I can only summarize his arguments and indicate his dogmatic point of view.

I should like, at the outset, to refer to Dr Caldecott's analysis and appreciation of theistic theories in his *Philosophy of Religion*. In discussing the Theism of the Will, he says (p. 80) that 'its character is too marked for it to be amalgamated with any other, but it is certain that the prevalence of Will-psychology, and the general inclination to Faith in theology, will cause this field to be more and more abundantly occupied in the near future'. Though some English scholars have been moving in that direction, it is Prof. Seeberg who has given us the most consistent and thorough-going exposition of Christian doctrine in terms of will, and any future work on those lines will be obliged to traverse the same ground.

The first volume of Prof. Seeberg's work lays the foundations of theology and anthropology on the philosophy of religion and epistemology. What is the fundamental conception of the Divine Being? So far as the Godhead is supramundane or holy, creative and universally active, it is the Primal Will (*Urwille*). Of course this category is in no way identical with the primal basis of the world in the sense of Neoplatonism, or the unconscious will, better called vital impulse or life-force, of Schopenhauer or Hartmann. The Primal Will is Love, and bestows the 'will to good' on man.

From an epistemological standpoint, the will is the inclusive term (*Inbegriff*) of human activity. Though we may emphasize, with Kant, the activity in thought, yet the latter is conditioned by the will. Panlogism leads with inward necessity to Voluntarism. The will is the lord and master in the household of the soul.

How is personality to be ascribed to God? Its nature has been well defined by Thomas Aquinas as *rationalis naturae individua substantia*, and the characteristic feature of persons is that *non solum aguntur sed per se agunt.* The Divine Personality, therefore, is the unity of self-consciousness and self-determination. God's Will and Thought = *actus purus*, or ceaseless activity.

We may interpret on this principle the threefold Personality (*Dreifältigkeit*) of God. Prof. Seeberg lays his emphasis rather on the three modes of action than on the three modes of being, and expresses his thought in three formulae:

(*a*) God wills, that the world of nature should exist, and come into existence;

(*b*) God wills, that the world, contrary to His will or sinful, should be subjected to His dominant will and thereby exist;

(*c*) God wills, that particular persons in their necessary interaction with other persons should become members of His church and be occupied in it. In short, the Father is God in nature, the Son is Lord of history or of the church, and the Holy Spirit is God in the individual soul. The distinction between the economic and the immanent Trinity may be logically maintained, but does not add any new fact to our knowledge of God. The properties of the Divine Will may be further defined as universal activity (*Allwirksamkeit*), which Prof. Seeberg prefers to Omnipotence (*Allmacht*), and Omnipresence which means that God is spiritually active in all things.

Man, on the other hand, may be generally defined as a free, self-determining being. He is so endowed by God that he can perform free acts, and is conscious of his freedom. Of course there are evil and selfish wills in the world, but the spiritual and social movement of mankind advances from conflicts of will to voluntary co-operation.

We pass, in the second volume, to the specific Christian doctrines of Sin, Atonement, and the Incarnation.

The real cause of sin is the evil will, and the universality of sin can be sufficiently explained without taking into account the physical inheritance of evil tendencies. It may be doubtful whether a physical predisposition to certain sins or particular psychical capacities and inclinations can be transmitted from parents to their children. The more important problem is the relation of evil to the Divine Will. Prof. Seeberg's answer to this question appears at first sight paradoxical. God wills evil as something which ought not to be, or a condition, which must be overcome by His power. But He does not will it, in so far as it should continue and remain. Anyhow, God does not merely permit evil, but overcomes it.

As to Prof. Seeberg's view of the Incarnation—he affirms repeatedly the true human personality of Jesus. The man Jesus can only take in as much of the Divine Being as is possible to human kind. So there is a gradual progressive developement in the human soul of Jesus. At the same time, there is constant harmony and conscious union of the human will with the divine in the Person of Christ. We must not think of Godhead and manhood as two physically limited beings existing over against one another in Jesus, but God was always in Him and He in God. The unity of the being of Christ rests therefore on the self-determination of the twofold personal life in Him.

This belief in the true Godhead and true manhood of Christ leads to a positive view of the Atonement as a true redemption from sin. Prof. Seeberg reviews and criticizes the various theories and aspects of the Atonement, but he seems to sum up his doctrine in the short statement that the Redeemer produces continually in men, by the power of His spirit, faith and love. We might indeed view the Atonement as the gradual reconciliation and union of the wills of men with the will of God, which was, once for all, achieved in Christ.

Prof. Seeberg adopts a moderate Lutheran standpoint in his view of the Church and the sacraments. The historical Church is distinguished from the Kingdom of God as the *ecclesia visibilis* from the *ecclesia invisibilis*, but still the Church is the Kingdom of God realizing itself on earth. The word of evangelical preaching must be regarded as the real means of grace, and the two great sacraments are symbolical actions, the meaning of which is established and made effective by the word. Infant baptism is the objective assurance of regeneration through the Holy Spirit and of remission of sins, which must be subjectively appropriated by the adult believer. In the same way, the Lord's Supper assures us of His spiritual presence, and we appropriate the benefits of moral renewal and forgiveness.

On the subject of eschatology: The end of all men is perfect communion with God, which can be fully realized only in eternal life. Then the real object of will and thought will be God. But there can be no true consummation of the Kingdom of God so long as there exists in the next world a vast number of unredeemed and unrepentant souls. The only method which will ensure God's final victory over evil and bring about the consummation of His Kingdom is Universalism. All souls must be subjected to God, that God may be all in all.

There are many details in Prof. Seeberg's work which would repay examination and discussion, but I hope that this summary of his teaching may give a fair impression of his latest contribution to Christian doctrine.

L. PATTERSON.

Theodore of Mopsuestia and Modern Thought, by L. Patterson, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 1926.)

The publisher's wrapper describes the book within as 'a careful monograph on a famous theologian of the Antiochene school'. There is no need to quarrel with the description, but it passes over one whole side of the work. It was not historical interest, so much as the 'modernity' of Theodore, that caused him to be chosen for this study, and Dr Patterson's aim has been (1) to give a presentation of faith in the Incarnation which can command the respect of a person of modern scientific education, and (2) to shew that it is substantially in accord with this representative of the ancient church.

The first half of the book gives a sympathetic and readable account of Theodore and his system, to which beginners in doctrinal history may well be directed. The second half indicates modern lines of thought, particularly with regard to the origin of man, heredity, and sin, with which the teaching of Theodore may be compared, and adumbrates a resultant 'modern' Christology and anthropology along lines of general resemblance to those of Antiochene teaching.

Nemesius von Emesa, *Anthropologie*, translated into German by Dr Emil Orth. (Verlag Maria-Martental, Kaisersesch, Coblenz, 1925.)

Nemesius, bishop of Emesa, was a neighbour and contemporary of Theodore of Mopsuestia. His activity as a Christian apologist is to be placed in the first decade of the fifth century. He was a convert late in life, and, approaching Christianity in the eclectic spirit typical of the later Neoplatonic age, saw in it the basis for a consistent philosophy. He ruled a church that was still doing battle with the long dominant sun-cultus of Emesa, a fact which lends point to his presentation of a Christianized philosophy as a persuasive to educated pagans towards Christian faith. The *Anthropology* of Nemesius is notable as an early work of specialized scientific study. It begins by examining the place of man in the universe, and adopts Theodore's doctrine that man is the σύνδεσμος of visible and invisible, rational and irrational. It goes farther in making him the highest term of an evolution whereby the one Creator progressively draws into union the dissimilar components of His manifold world. This estimate of man's nature is supported by analysis of its constituents, which also reveals the extensive part played by the irrational in human psychology, the interplay of conscious purpose and primitive instinct, and the place of the involuntary and unconscious in a whole of which the conscious is only a part. In determining the nature and extent of the actual freedom of the will, Nemesius considers current belief in destiny and the power of the stars, and closes with a short enquiry into the possibility of foreknowledge. The work is one of prime importance to historians of philosophy. And if it would be going too far to number Nemesius among the writers of the Antiochene doctrinal school, his *Anthropology* affords the student of doctrine valuable insight into the thought-background of the Christological school of Antioch.

Dr Orth has done a service to the non-specialist reader by his translation and excellent short introduction. His modest brochure should find a place on many English bookshelves.

Des hl. Basilius d. Gr. Geistliche Übungen, by Dr JOSEPH WITTIG. (Aderholz, Breslau, 1922.)

THIS pamphlet is the first of a series of 'Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie'. Its subject is the (probably unauthentic) Commentary on Isaiah which appears at the end of the Benedictine edition of St Basil. Garnier, the original editor, was firmly against it; Maran, who completed his work, wavered; but Bardenhewer declares it the work of a Caesarean presbyter at the close of the fourth century. Dr Wittig sets out to prove, not only that it is substantially St Basil's, but that it had its origin in addresses given by St Basil to the Pontic bishops who met him at Dazimon in the winter of 374–5. This seems rather much to prove, and while the reader can hardly fail to be interested in the subject, he is not likely to find the argument always convincing.

Dr Wittig's argument starts from the fact that the Commentary begins with an allegorical interpretation of 'Pray that your flight be not in the winter or on the sabbath day'. Now the time of the Dazimon conference was *winter*, Atarbius had just *fled*, and the fact of his having alleged a dream to the discredit of Basil's orthodoxy would make the disquisition on true and false prophecy, which follows, topical.

This may strike the reader as a little thin. But what will he say when he finds Dr Wittig, faced with Garnier's contention that the Commentary lacks the 'gravitas' and *warmth* of St Basil, retorting that it was winter when he wrote it and he had a bad chill? (p. 49).

Dr Wittig has done well to recall attention to an interesting document, but has not, perhaps, settled the problems it presents.

Baius et le Baianisme, by F.-X. JANSEN, S.J. (Desbarax, Louvain, 1927.)

THIS is No. 18 in a series published by the Museum Lessianum at Louvain. It is a theological essay on Baius (or, to name him in a modern form, Chancellor Michel de Bay, of Louvain University) and his ideas. Baius is interesting to Belgian readers as one of the most brilliant academic figures in the history of his great university. To the theological reader anywhere he is one of the most interesting thinkers of the Tridentine period, affording a striking example of the way in which thought-movements, whose chief expression is in the reformed creeds, affected persons who remained in the Roman communion. For Baius, as for many of the leaders of the Reformation, the revived study of Scripture and of St Augustine formed a main creative impulse. He steeped himself in the work of the great African Father, until he was able to work it into what seemed to him one consistent theology in full agreement with the voice of church authority. In the eyes of the pope's advisers it seemed to have Protestant traits, particularly in the tendency shewn to accept the expressions of the Doctor of Hippo in preference to the utterances of the 'living voice' of the church. In 1567 Pius V in a 'Constitution' condemned seventy-six propositions touching the Fall, Original Sin, Free Will, and Grace, of which the greater part had been asserted in the works of Baius. Thus curbed, Baius continued his official duties of lecturing and administration (with some displays of moderate insubordination) and died in the peace of the church. He exemplifies extreme reaction from scholasticism, not as from something artificial, but as from something vitiated by the taint of paganism. He saw the legacy of heathendom particularly in scholastic anthropology. Belief in natural virtue, moral free will, and a natural knowledge of God seemed to him the illusions of heathen men. On the other hand, he thought it morally inconsistent with the Christian idea of God to suppose that He would withhold impassibility, immortality, and immunity from concupiscence from man in his original creation. Granting that, then the 'decentia Creatoris' demands their restoration in full. This is accomplished by the indwelling of the Divine Spirit, which, if not actually part of man's true nature, is at any rate connatural to man. When once the Holy Spirit rules in a man, every act of his which is in accordance with the Divine Law is an act of Charity, and constitutes a step on the way to complete restoration to the beatific vision. Contrary acts arise, even in the elect, as a result of invincible concupiscence, but the sacraments of the church are a sufficient remedy.

Father Jansen finds it easier to define the present Roman doctrine against Baius than to say how far the effects of such refutation reach. 'Soyons francs', he says, 'en condemnant Baius, il semble que l'église Catholique ait faussé définitivement compagnie au Docteur d'Hippone'. For him, it is matter for argument whether St Augustine meant what the church condemns, but not at all whether the 'magistère vivant' or he is in the wrong, should they not agree. In accordance with this point of view, he is particularly severe on Baius for his admission that without the light of Scripture the church would fall back into the shadows.

The non-Roman reader, on the other hand, will feel that to men like Baius nothing was more certain than that the revived study of Scripture had drawn the church out of shadows. And the book will lose something for him by the fact that the author must treat his subject as one for condemnation rather than appreciation. But it is an able and scholarly book, full of doctrinal interest and pleasant to read.

Konfessionskunde, by Dr HERMANN MULERT. (Töpelmann, Giessen, 1927.)

THIS is the second instalment, complementary to that which appeared last year, and was reviewed in this JOURNAL (vol. xxix p. 72). The two instalments are purely for convenience in publishing, and divide in the middle of a sentence. The purchaser is expected to bind them up in one cover, and for this purpose a title-page, preface, and table of contents is supplied loose with the new instalment, while a special binding is advertised by the publisher. The whole forms Volume V in a series 'Theologie im Abriss'. Proceeding from Oriental Christianity as the most traditional form, Dr Mulert traverses in turn Romanism, Anglicanism, and Continental Protestantism, until in the Anglo-American non-Catholic bodies he leaves traditionalism farthest behind, and finds subjectivism at its maximum. The present instalment takes up the tale somewhat over half-way through the account of Romanism.

English readers will be specially interested to know what such an observer as Dr Mulert thinks of Anglicanism. Needless to say, his survey of the facts is excellent, and he is quite aware that an understanding of Anglicanism involves an understanding of English mentality. Of some of the qualities of Englishmen he has a kindly, not to say generous, appreciation. But the fact remains that it does not enable him to make head or tail of Anglicanism. He sees the practical ability which enables the Church of England at home and abroad to maintain itself as an ecclesiastical organization. He notes the variety of interests that maintain themselves within the one pale. But no *rationale* emerges, no specifically Anglican theology is mentioned, nor any dogmatic standpoint described. Dr Mulert mentions the Lambeth encyclical, but it does not argue for him anything but a strong practical desire for Christian reunion. He does not appear to dream of this strange and very English body conceiving of itself as a tentative rallying-point for the reunion of Christendom.

That centrality of position seems to him to belong to Rome, had Rome the will to use it. Standing midway between the extremes of traditionalism and subjectivism, Rome could mediate, but will not. Dr Mulert will not speculate far as to the future of Romanism, but predicts that Modernism is not yet done with. Meanwhile he concludes that the very idea of corporate reunion in Christendom can be desirable only when it is conceived upon lines of more elasticity and width of sympathy than are provided by any existing communion to-day. *Konfessionskunde* is a wise as well as an instructive book.

W. TELFER.

Karl Barths 'Kritische Theologie', von Dr. Theol. TH. L. HAITJEMA. Deutsche Ausgabe besorgt von PETER SCHUMACHER. (H. Veenman & Zonen, Wageningen, 1926.)

THIS is a German translation of a course of lectures delivered by a Dutch Professor on the Theology of Karl Barth. The author is a Professor of Theology in the University of Groningen; the translator is a German pastor; the subject of the book is a Swiss, who was for many years a pastor in the Reformed Church in Switzerland.

Since the revolution which is associated with the name of Karl Barth is perhaps the most important religious movement in Swiss, German, and Dutch Protestantism at the present time, it is important that a serious attempt should be made in England to understand its significance. For this purpose these lectures are admirably suitable, partly because they are clearly written and well arranged, partly because a Dutch Theologian has behind him a tradition which enables him to interpret Karl Barth better than the Germans. The book consists of 140 pages and contains six lectures: (1) Karl Barth as witness to the Revelation, (2) the Theology of Karl Barth, (3) Karl Barth as the product of his age, (4) the Colleagues (Gesinnungsgenossen) of Karl Barth, (5) Karl Barth and his Critics, (6) Karl Barth and Dutch Theology. The second lecture is the most important, the others being chiefly valuable in elucidating it.

Karl Barth is not a dogmatic theologian, nor does his theology rest upon a peculiar religious experience capable of psychological treatment. He vigorously protests against scholasticism or intellectualism and against mysticism as providing any sure ground for the knowledge of God. His theology is not a theology to be placed among other theologies. He brings no additional information which must be assimilated to other knowledge. He simply demands a new method of approach, a new point of view, in thinking about God, Christ, men, faith, and grace. His work, therefore, is primarily a criticism of religious knowledge, a series of 'marginal glosses' to the Gospel and to Christian theology. The problem as he sees it is not what men believe or ought to believe, but what belief is; not what men can know about God, but what kind of knowledge the knowledge of God is.

The assumption which underlies everything that Barth writes is that God is God, and men are men, and that the line which separates the two can be crossed neither by human thought nor by human experience. God is neither an object which men can calmly contemplate, nor a person with whom they can make contact. This is to make God the object and men the subject. The truth is precisely the opposite. God is the only subject, and men are—under His judgement. Only by election can the world which lies beyond this world become anything but a vacuum for men; only by the action of the living God can men be drawn over the line which separates this world from the other. God's action descends vertically, miraculously upon those who believe and are under *Krisis*. God is the only subject, and the believer is the object who is moved. The problem is therefore not what Barth thinks about God, but what God thinks about Barth, not what Barth thinks about Jesus Christ and the Scriptures, but what Christ thinks about Barth, and how the Word of God judges him. There is no Barthian theology, no Barthian psychological experience. The theologian has simply to bear witness to the power and reality of the living God. But even here no direct witness is possible. The theologian cannot declare the Word of God, nor could his hearers receive it, if he could. He can only bear witness to revelation and await a miracle.

Barth is thus involved in a whole series of paradoxes, and intentionally so, because the 'dialectical' method is alone adequate to express the truth. The dialectical method is opposed both to the dogmatic and to the mystical or 'critical' method and consists of a vigorous statement of opposites which must explain one another. The Yes must explain the No, and the No the Yes. There is no synthesis possible. For example, the glory of God in the created world can only be spoken of by remembering that He is completely hidden from our eyes; the complete destruction of death can only be thought of in the light of the majesty of the wholly other life which meets us in death; the thought of man made in the image of God can only be uttered in one breath with the clear recognition that man as we know him is fallen, and that we know more of his misery than of his glory; sin can only be mentioned with the knowledge that it is forgiven, else we should not recognize it. For Barth the dialectical method is the only road to the knowledge of God. And yet the method is not of itself of value, otherwise it would be another means of 'clambering up to God'. The method is valuable simply because it is a means, not of speaking about God, but of making room for Him to speak and act.

This dialectical prolegomena, however, does not touch the question as to where the revelation of God is to be found. All that is said is that the theologian must speak about God, and that this is impossible.

At this point all Barth's thoughts run to Jesus Christ, and yet not to Him directly, but to Him through the witness borne to Him by His first witnesses; that is, to the Scriptures. The Holy Scriptures are the source of the knowledge of God. This must not, however, be understood as though the Scriptures are in themselves objective truth. The revelation of God does not so much stand in the Scriptures as occurs, acts, through them, through the actual Biblical texts, through the words which the Apostles and Prophets said, or wished to say. The historical and psychological problems which the Scriptures, when isolated from this power in the believer, raise for the critics are wholly secondary and ultimately irrelevant. Barth can contemplate with equanimity the possibility that the scriptural narratives are myths. The Scriptures are authoritative, not because they are historical, but because they reveal the power of God to the believer and bring him under His judgement. For this reason Barth is supported by Rudolf Bultmann and by an increasing number of younger German radical N.T. scholars.

Theology therefore proceeds, and can only proceed, from the individual who fears God. Dr Haitjema regards this as Barth's most important contribution at the present time. The value of his work lies in his epistemology. At the conclusion of the second lecture, however, he outlines Barth's teaching concerning God, Jesus Christ, and eschatology.

God is the Mover, the Creator, the Redeemer. 'God' is the word for all that lies beyond the line of death. He is the Completely Other, the New World, the Resurrection of the Dead. Unknown, He speaks in His silence; merciful, in His unapproachable holiness. He who says 'God', says miracle, revelation. There is no road from men to God, there is only the road from God to men. Consequently there can be no doctrine of God *in abstracto*, because revelation involves faith, and faith involves the believer. Barth can therefore only think of God in relation to those whom He has created and redeemed, and he can only think of men as they actually exist in relation to God, as fallen men. The recognition of sin is the perception of redemption, and there is only one ethical action, and that is repentance.

Jesus Christ is the revelation of God in history. He is the absolute miracle, God become man. That is to say, in Jesus Christ the two worlds meet and divide: the known world created by God, but fallen from union with Him, the world of men, of time, and of things—our world; and the world of the Father, of the original creation and ultimate redemption. The point at which these two worlds cross and intersect is Jesus, the historical Jesus of Nazareth. But, again, it is impossible to speak of Him *in abstracto*. He is not something given. The apostolic witness that Jesus Christ is Lord is all that can be repeated. We can merely bear witness to their witness. The witness is the witness of Scripture and of the Apostles' Creed, it is not a witness to the Jesus of history direct and abstracted from the apostolic faith in Him. We ought not to think of the death of Jesus except as the judgement of death pronounced in the flesh over sin and over us as sinful men. Nor can His death be thought of apart from His resurrection and of the resurrection of those who believe from the death which sin brings with it. The death and resurrection of Jesus Christ are the corner-stones of redemption. Barth can never think of them as direct, impersonal, independent, historical events. They are realities perceived by faith alone; and, further, though they may be described as events in history, they do not inaugurate a new era in history, they are the end of history, since only with the end of history can our sins end and the new life begin.

Belief in the Risen Christ is pure eschatology, in the sense that the believer is lifted above the whole historical and psychological process of this world. There can be no history after redemption. The resurrection is not an episode or event which brings with it a new history, otherwise redemption would be a thing possessed and capable of historical or psychological treatment. That is, however, precisely what it is not. And yet Barth must not be so understood as though hope forms no element in Christian faith. Faith and eschatology have not swallowed up hope. In a certain sense all is still hope, since everything that belongs to the world, the man of flesh and blood, is still unredeemed. The final redemption, the fulfilment of the promise of redemption in time, will come only with the *Parousia* of Christ.

Here Barth ends. Dr Haitjema is of the opinion that he cannot remain where he is, and he sees signs in the later articles contributed by Barth to the journal *Zwischen den Zeiten* that he is aware that he must deal far more seriously with the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, if he is to escape from the crude individualism into which he has fallen. In this connexion it is interesting to compare the writings of Barth with those of Jacques Maritain, and especially with his last book *Trois Réformateurs*, *Luther*, *Descartes*, *Rousseau*.

Barth and Maritain are moving along similar lines. But whereas Barth is Protestant to the core, Maritain is a convinced Catholic. What the Scriptures are to Barth, the Church and the Sacraments and the Scriptures, taken as a whole, are to Maritain. In comparing the two there emerges an uncomfortable suspicion that whereas Maritain might perhaps understand Barth, Barth has as yet shewn no glimmering of a perception of the significance of that Catholicism by which men like Maritain are moved and redeemed.

EDWYN C. HOSKYNS.

Latin Infancy Gospels, by M. R. James, Litt.D. (Cambridge, 1927.)

For more than forty years the Provost of Eton has interested himself in the perplexing problems which are connected with the Gospel and the Apocalypse of Peter. Already in 1886 he had reached conclusions concerning the latter, which were remarkably confirmed when in the early days of 1892 he and I had the satisfaction of collaborating in the first presentation to English scholars of the newly published fragments of these lost apocryphal writings. Since then he has pursued his investigations and elaborated his conclusions, until quite lately he has surprised us by the statement that the two fragments are almost certainly parts of the same book, and that the writer of the Gospel according to Peter embodied in the last part of his Gospel an already existing Apocalypse of Peter in a somewhat abbreviated form. He has now given us a greater surprise still in the production of large portions of a hitherto unregarded document relating to the Birth of Christ, which he believes to represent the story of the Nativity with which the Gospel according to Peter began.

The discovery is one of those which come only to the trained observer, and which come when he is looking for something else. A thirteenth-century book in the Chapter Library at Hereford contains forty Homilies on the Gospels, and at the end twenty leaves of a liturgical document wherein the treasure is hidden. First we have the Office for the Feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, a festival on the specially English vogue of which Edmund Bishop has written in the tenth essay of his *Liturgica Historica*. The Office contains nine Lessons taken from a long Latin compilation which at first looks like a form of the *Liber de Infantia*, otherwise known as the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, but which soon betrays the use of other materials. At the end of the Office the rest of this compilation is added in a continuous form; and this is one of the texts which Dr James now prints for the first time. Most of the contributory elements are more or less familiar to students of this literature, and they have been clearly indicated from page to page of this edition. But there are a few blocks of new material relating to the Birth of Christ and to the visits of the Shepherds and the Magi. This new source is markedly Docetic, evidently of Greek origin and of second-century date.

Happily Mr Robin Flower was able to guide Dr James to what proved to be another text of the same compilation in an Arundel MS which he had noted as akin to certain Irish Infancy stories, which he was cataloguing in the British Museum. This is a much better text for the portions which concern us: for in the Hereford text the rough style has been considerably modified and difficulties have been smoothed away. We may give a specimen of this Arundel text as translated by Dr James in his Introduction: it is part of the account given by the midwife:

> When therefore the hour drew near the power of God came forth openly, and the maiden standing looking toward heaven became like a †vine†. For now was coming forth the end of good things. But when the light had come forth she adored him whom she saw she had brought forth.
>
> Now that child was shining round about like the sun, mightily, pure and most pleasant in aspect: inasmuch as he alone hath appeared †wholly† peace making peace.
>
> Now in that hour wherein he was born there was heard a voice of many invisible ones saying with one voice Amen. And that light which was born was multiplied, and with the brightness of its light it darkened the light of the sun. And this cave also was filled with bright light, with a most sweet perfume.
>
> Now this light was so born like as dew from heaven descended upon the earth. For the perfume of it is fragrant more than all the scent of ointment.
>
> Now I stood amazed and marvelling, and fear laid hold upon me; for I was looking upon so great brightness of the light that was born. But that light by little and little withdrawing into itself made itself like to an infant, and in a moment it became an infant as infants are wont to be born.
>
> And I put on boldness and bowed myself and touched him and lifted him up in my hands with great fear; and I was smitten with fear, for there was no weight in him as of a man that is born. And I looked upon him, and there was not in him any defilement, but he was as it were all shining (*or* washed) with the dew of the most high God, light in body to bear, and bright to look upon.
>
> And as I wondered much because he did not cry like as infants new-born are wont to cry, and as I held him, looking upon his face, he smiled upon me with a most merry smile; and opening his eyes he looked upon me sharply, and suddenly there came forth a great light from his eyes, as a great lightning.

The conception is highly poetic. The Virgin stands in silence with her gaze heavenwards: a Light is born from her, which presently shapes itself into a Child. But, as Dr James says, it is not a human child at all: 'if ever there was a Docetic account of the Lord's birth, it is here'. And it is not really like any account which we have had before.

A suggestion may be offered in emendation of the text. Dr James has obelized the word 'vine', which plainly is wrong. The two Latin forms are as follows:

ARUNDEL.	HEREFORD.
Et stans puella intuens in celum ut uinea facta est.	perstitit puella immobiliter intuens in celum.

The Hereford text simply shirks the difficulty. The Irish form of the story, printed at the end of the book, gives us no help; for the Docetic details have been pruned away.

Let us begin by reading *niuea* for *uinea*. The epithet might be meant to suggest the snowy whiteness of a transfiguration. But what was the underlying Greek? Has not our rude translator got astray by mistaking ὡς *κίων* for ὡς χιών? She stood as though she had been turned into a *pillar*; just as a little earlier we are told: 'sicut solida petra, ita immobilis permanebat, in celum intendens'. *Κίων* is not a common word except in poetry, though it was used in architecture.[1] But we need not grudge it to a writer who *ex hypothesi* uses λαχμός, ἰχώρ, and *πύον*. Our translator did not know it, and he did the best he could with it, calling to mind ὡς χιών in Mt. xxviii 3, if not also Mc. ix 3. This seems to me a possible way of explaining *niuea*: but, as Nennius says, *Cedo illi qui plus noverit in ista peritia quam ego.*

It will be convenient to some of our readers to be reminded of the series of articles in this JOURNAL, vol. xii (1910–11), in which Dr James called attention to the then newly discovered Ethiopic form of the Apocalypse of Peter. He has there set out his view that the Akhmim fragments of the Gospel and Apocalypse are parts of one book, and that the writer of the Gospel has embodied in an altered and much abbreviated form a considerable section of the Apocalypse of Peter, the full text of which is not unfairly represented in the Ethiopic document. This theory is of interest here because the New Source, which Dr James would wish to identify with the Nativity section of the Gospel according to Peter, has in his opinion made free use of the *Protevangelium* of James; so that the author of the Gospel is once again seen to be a borrower on a large scale.

It is too early to say more than that this bold reconstruction of the Gospel according to Peter is exceedingly attractive. Even if the criticism which it will doubtless receive should lead to its modification, our admiration of the discovery of this new material and our gratitude to its interpreter will remain undiminished.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

Die Achmîmische Version der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, herausgegeben von WALTER TILL. (Coptica IV, Havniae, 1927.)

THE four principal Egyptian Bible versions are familiar, by name at least, to theologians, who are further aware of the high antiquity usually ascribed to that called—with scarcely adequate justification—the

---

[1] Cf. Pollux *Onomasticon* (ed. Bekker) p. 303: *Κιόκρανα αἱ κεφαλαὶ τῶν κιόνων, καὶ στυλοβάτης ἡ τοῦ Δωρικοῦ κίονος βάσις, σπεῖρα δὲ ἡ τοῦ Ἰωνικοῦ.*

Achmîmic. This version, a mere fragmentary remnant to-day, is at any rate represented by very venerable manuscripts; indeed the remains of Achmîmic literature, whether Biblical or other, are extant only in early MSS, none among them being younger than the sixth, perhaps even than the fifth, century.

The fifth (or ? fourth) century parchment volume, to which the 133 leaves here edited once belonged, has been the object of various publications: G. Maspero was the first to make known a part of it, and his edition was repeated by U. Bouriant. These were the leaves long lost, but to-day, it is understood, again in Cairo. Those in Vienna, first described by J. Krall, were, twelve years ago, fully edited by C. Wessely.[1] That edition was a notable achievement; Professor Wessely is not a Coptic scholar *ex professo*, though Coptic scholars owe him gratitude for many a valuable text made available, and in the decipherment of this one he undertook a formidable task. It suffices to look at the plates of his edition (Pl. 2 *supra* especially) to realize the extreme difficulty of reading a MS the frequent transparency of whose parchment, whereby *recto* and *verso* appear inextricably confused, and the all but total disappearance on many pages of whose ink renders anything approaching certainty often unattainable. And Wessely's edition will retain its practical value for three reasons: for its photographic plates, for its convenient system of displaying the Sa'idic and Bohairic parallels alongside the Achmîmic text, and for its supplementary reproduction of Bouriant's print, thus giving us in one volume all that has survived of the original codex.

Dr Till's revision, however, sets the study of this invaluable text upon a new basis. Not only has he re-read and, in countless details, improved all that Wessely gave us,[2] but by utilizing the off-sets of pages now lost upon many of those extant, he has succeeded in adding considerably to the available total. By his previous studies Dr Till was especially fitted for the editing of an Achmîmic text, and it is to his forthcoming Grammar that all interested in this ancient dialect now look forward. He has prefaced the text itself with highly interesting notes upon the character of the version, though disclaiming any pretensions to a critical estimate. With this, however, students of the *Dodecapropheton* will not be long able to dispense, for the Achmîmic version is shewn by Till to depend upon an underlying text of a remarkable type. Its nearest relative is naturally the Sa'idic, yet it is often found to be nearer to the Hebrew text and the Vulgate than to this. Sometimes it goes with the Latin against all other witnesses, very rarely it coincides with the peculiarities of the Bohairic. In not a few cases it has singularities of its own to shew, while now and then the reader is offered alternative renderings of a phrase, side by side. Till believes he has grounds for assuming a precedent Achmîmic text, immediately behind that here before us; be that as it may, there is evidence at any rate for a Sa'idic version, intermediate between it and the Greek; and so we have a further argument in support of the view that a Sa'idic version was, after all, the earliest current in Upper Egypt.[1] The idiom in which the version is made shews in fact Sa'idic influence here and there—negatively, for the most part, in the absence of certain distinctive grammatical features which a full-blooded Achmîmic text would be expected to shew.[2]

---

[1] As vol. xvi of his *Studien zur Paläographie &c.*

[2] Many emendations had already been proposed in Spiegelberg's review, *OLZ.*, 1918, 24.

The MS is not only as good as illegible now in many parts; its writer is often inaccurate or inconsistent, so that, despite Dr Till's labours, much uncertainty still prevails. The following notes are, for the most part, mere suggestions in places particularly obscure or doubtful.

Hos. ii 6. Preserved in Shenoute (Zoega 590, if this be his, *Rev. Ég*. x 164), where ϫⲗϫⲗ is the form used.

— v 11. I do not see any objection to ϩⲱⲛⲧ for ἤρξατο; cf. for instance ϩⲱⲛ ἤδη Mk. iv 37 *S*.

— viii 1. How would ϯⲛⲁϯ ⲕⲁϩ do here? He is clearly following the LXX and wishes to account for its γῆ. But the early Glossary, *JEA*. xi 245, does not seem to confirm this.

— ix 13. ϫⲉⲓⲁⲓⲧ, though it looks like a qualitative, stands, I suggest, for ϫⲓ (ⲟⲩ)ⲁⲓⲧ. Cf. Vulg. *fundata*. With the still obscure ϫⲟⲉⲓⲧ (*CO*. 304, &c.) it will not fit.

— —. Infinitive *plus* article is quite in order (Stern, § 468 end), e.g. Job xxvii 14 *S*, where this very locution recurs: ⲉⲡⲕⲟⲛⲥⲟⲩ εἰς σφαγήν.

— x 11. ϭⲣⲓ, cf. Vulg. *confringit sulcos*.

— xi 7. ⲕⲧⲟ, cf. Vulg. *reditum*.

— xii 11. If ϫⲛⲉⲩ (which Wessely read) were a possible form, it would be preferable to ϫⲓⲧ. Vulg. has *acervus*; cf. ϭⲛⲱⲟⲩ Ex. viii 10 *B* θημωνίαι *aggeres*.

Am. vi 5 ⲕⲁⲩⲉ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ *esteem*, as in Lu. xiv 18 *S* ἔχειν.

Mic. vii 17 ⲗⲱϫ, though rare, occurs: Paris 130^3, 59 *S they stood around the little mills*, ⲉⲩⲗⲉϫ ⲛⲟⲉⲓⲧ *licking up flour with their tongues, because of the great famine*.

---

[1] Dr Till's notes upon Hos. vii 4 and ix 13 look as if he regards the Coptic as affected immediately by the Hebrew text.

[2] Dr Till promises a study of these dialectal gradations, which may have chronological, but more probably local causes.

Ob. i 5. There can surely be no doubt that the verb here is ⲣⲱϩⲉ, whose normal suffixed form is ⲣⲁϣⲧ- *S*. It is even found as here, with ⲱ, in Budge *Mart.* 180. The prefixed ⲧⲉ- remains indeed a puzzle.

Nah. ii 12 ⲁϥⲉⲟⲩⲉ ⲛϭⲱⲃ Did he read ἀπέπληξε for ἀπέπνιξε?

— iii 3. If ϥⲓ ⲟⲩⲱϩ is correct, cf. its meaning in *S take a step*, *beat* (like wave), and so possibly *glitter* (of metals).

— iii 7 ϯ ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓ needs no emendation. Cf. 2 Kgd. xvii 20 ζητεῖν.

Hab. iii 5 ⲛϩⲁⲗⲉϩⲧⲉ = *S*, but om. Gk. Vulg. Did he read πετεινοῖς for πεδειλοῖς?

— iii 12 ⲕⲛⲁϩⲓ ⲛⲕⲁϩ with Vulg. *conculcabis terram*. ⲛⲁ with ϩⲓ- would be strange.

— 13. By reading ⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ instead of the doubtful ⲗⲟⲩⲥⲉ, one gets the equivalent of *S* (Schleifer and Shenoute *CSCO.* 73 18), though ⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ is found in *A* only in the (sa'idicized) Prov. vi 9 and in *A*².

Zeph. i 2. For ⲙⲁϫⲉ = ⲛⲁϫⲉ, *v. Mon. of Epiphanius* i 243 *inf.*

— i 16 and iii 6 ⲧⲁϣ for γωνία is scarcely credible. One is tempted to read ⲧⲁⲩ = ⲧⲟⲟⲩ *S*.

Hag. i 2. ⲕⲱⲧ- as stat. constr. is not unknown; Sa'idic dialects, as well as Achm., tend to use long-vowelled forms here; *v. Mon. of Epiph.* i 250.

— i 8. A very corrupt (or ill-copied) citation of this is to be read in a fresco at Bawît (Clédat *Baouit* i 60, where ⲡⲁϫⲱⲟⲩ must surely represent ⲡⲁⲉⲟⲟⲩ). In ⲟⲩⲁⲛϩⲉⲥ (?) must be embedded, as Till saw, some form of ⲟⲩⲱϩⲉ; while in the phrase preceding one might suggest ⲧⲉⲧⲛϣ[ⲟⲩⲟ]ⲩⲧ ϩⲉ, again unshortened, though construct.

Zach. i 9. In spite of lack of Achm. support, I should take ⲟⲩⲟ to be the equivalent of *S* ⲟⲩⲟⲩ, as in Amélineau's *Schenoudi* i 115 ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ϩⲱⲱϥⲡⲉ, or Rossi *Papiri* i iv 25 ⲛⲧⲕⲟⲩⲟⲩ.

— iii 9. For this ϣⲓⲧ in *S* perhaps, *v. JEA.* xiii 24 n.

— iv 2. ϩⲗⲁⲡ = *S* ϣⲗⲟⲡ *strand*, *ply* of rope; so here perhaps of wick?

(— vi 12, from Bouriant's leaves, ϩⲛⲟⲩⲥϩⲛⲉ. How should this represent ὑποκάτωθεν? Vulg. has *subter*. To suggest that the Copt read *subito* would be to raise a problem not as yet envisaged.)

— x 8. I think ⲙⲙⲁⲥ can, as read by Wessely and as required, be read on the photograph (Rainer *Führer*² Taf. vi), where merely the under part of the ⲁ has disappeared.

Zach. xiv 1. ⲉⲓⲥⲡⲉ, all but a ἅπαξ λεγ. [όμενον], is found again in Amélineau *op. cit.* i 95, though there rather with the force of ⲉϣϫⲡⲉ.

— xiv 5. ⲧⲱϭⲉ ⲁϩⲟⲩⲛ ἐγκολληθῆναι, as for προσκολ. in Num. xxxvi 7, 2 Kgd. xxiii 10 *S*.

— xiv 12. This is cited in the Homily of Pesenthius, *ROC.* xx 55, where we read ⲡⲉⲩⲕⲱⲗⲙ.

Plenty of interesting puzzles still remain, as for instance: ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲉ in Hos. iv 12, ⲉϩⲟ in Am. vi 6, ϫⲁⲛⲧⲟⲩ in Hab. i 8, ⲑⲃ̄ⲃⲓⲟ in Zach. xi 12. And in the admirable index which follows the text there are one or two points to note: ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲧ Mic. v 6 is a *lance* (*S* ⲙⲁⲕⲟⲧ), as Vulg. *lanceis* shews, *v. JEA*. viii 117; ⲥⲣⲁⲙⲣⲙ Hab. ii 16 is *to fall asleep*, Vulg. *consopire*; ⲧⲁⲃ̄ⲧⲃ̄ⲉ Nah. iii 17 is, I take it, meant for *συμμικτός*; ⲱⲛ 'Heliopolis, passim' is a mystery, since it does not occur in these books; ϥⲱϭⲉ Mic. iii 9 is but a variant of ϥⲱⲧⲉ-ⲃ̄ⲱⲧⲉ, with ϭ = ⲧ, as often; ϩⲛⲟ ⲛⲓⲙ is for *all* only in Zeph. iii 7; ϩⲏⲛⲉ Am. ii 1 must, I think, be *lime* (*εἰς κονίαν*); ϫⲟ Hos. viii 7 either *seed*, which would not be unsuitable, or *wind*, though unknown unless in ϫⲓⲛⲧⲏⲩ, ϫⲓⲙⲫⲉ; ϫⲟ Ob. 7 *send* seems doubtful and might rather be referred to ϫⲁⲩ. Finally I may add that I am glad to find Dr Till holding a common-sensible view of the often-discussed phenomenon ϫ = ⳝ, recurrent in various early texts (and here in Hos. ii 15, iii 1; Hab. ii 18; Zach. x 11). He treats their confusion simply as a graphic error and ascribes to it no phonetic importance (*v. ZDMG*. 66 783 n).

Let us hope that the same editor may some day be in a position to re-edit the Cairo leaves, which he was unfortunately debarred from including in the present volume.

W. E. Crum.

Erklärung des Hohen Liedes, by G. Kuhn. (A. Deichert, Leipzig, 1926.)

The greater part of this small work (pp. 1–67) has already been published by its author, the Swiss scholar Dr Kuhn, in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1926, pp. 501 ff and 521 ff); but the fresh translation of the poem there published has been unfortunately here omitted owing to the cost of printing.

In the first part (pp. 1–59) the author gives a full and detailed analysis of the poem, accompanied by a brief running commentary. Several emendations of the text, some of which are worthy of consideration, are proposed (i 1 and 3; iii 10; iv 4, 5, 8, and 9; v 6 and 12; vi 12; vii 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 14; viii 2, 6, 10, and 13). In the middle of this section (pp. 40–42) he propounds his explanation of the term 'Shulammite' (vi 13). As others have done, he sees a reference to Abishag the Shunammite, who was 'very fair' (1 Kings i 2–4), and incidentally asks whether she may not ultimately have become Solomon's wife? Again, like others, he sees in the change from *n* to *l* a desire to obtain an assonance with the name of Solomon; but, further than this, he recalls משלם 'he that is at friendship with', 'the trusted friend of' Yahweh (Is. xlii 19) and suggests that שׁוּלמית[1] can similarly signify 'the trusted one' or even 'trust' (cf. שְׁלֹמִית in Lev. xxiv 11 and 1 Chron. iii 19). The name, then, is to be interpreted as a title of high honour, indicating that she is 'the trusted' of the king, even as she is elsewhere called the sister, the bride of Solomon (iv 10).

The second part (pp. 59–67) is the most interesting as containing the author's interpretation of the poem. It is not a description of a purely human *Liebesverhältniss*, even though every pure human love finds itself mirrored in it—but only in part; for the moral education, which both husband and wife normally undergo in marriage, is here confined to the woman. She is guided upwards till she reaches the stage of developement to which she was destined from the beginning. The *dôdh* is not an ordinary Israelite but an ideal figure, appearing under the name of Solomon. Yet there is a lower and a higher Solomon; at first he appears as a shepherd (i 7), then as a vigorous young man (ii 8 ff), and finally in kingly guise (iii 6 ff). The transformation is repeated in the latter part of the poem, where he appears at first as a poor man begging admission (v 2 ff), then as one whose worth is recognized (v 10 ff), afterwards again in royal state (vi 44), and finally as Solomon (viii 12). He is, in fact, a kind of providence whereby the moral developement of the woman is effected.

The ethical tendency is everywhere predominant (e. g. i 7–8, ii 8 ff, and iv 8 ff). In short, here is *ḥokhmâh* which is so often found concealed where a purely erotic love seems to appear; and this element of 'Wisdom' agrees with the literary affinities between this book and the other so-called Solomonic writings. The person of Solomon is the representative of wisdom, while the 'Shulammite' (between whose name and his there is a clear assonance) is the seeker after wisdom. This is a reversal of the usual picture in which wisdom is the bride wooed by a lover (cf. Wisd. viii 2); but it agrees with the story how the Queen of Sheba sought out Solomon (1 Kings x 1 ff).

The poem, then, is an allegory not in any of the usual forms but in the sense that the lover is an ideal person, the true Solomon, the personification of pure wisdom. Yet this is not meant as an immaterial idea, but there floats before the author's mind a real individuality in which wisdom takes form, as it were the flesh become wisdom, and with which the soul or even the collective Israel in search of wisdom can enter into a real, personal relationship.

The last part (pp. 67–75), which alone contains matter hitherto unpublished, is occupied with some critical notes on various passages of the ancient versions.

---

[1] On p. 42, l. 14 שׁוּלמית is a misprint for שׁוּלמית.

In conclusion, it may be said that the author's interpretation of this perplexing poem is interesting, if not entirely convincing, and well worth rescuing from the oblivion of a theological journal.

Textstudien zum Buche Hiob, by G. Richter. (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1927.)

These studies in Job are intended as a supplement to the author's *Erläuterungen zu dunkeln Stellen im Buche Hiob*, published in 1912; but he has included in it brief summaries of his earlier notes for the benefit of those readers who have not seen the original volume.

In a small book of ninety-one pages the author has discussed a large number of passages and has sought to explain or remove the difficulties (which are often due to metrical presuppositions), with varying degrees of success. Sometimes he appears to suspect the text needlessly: for example, he reads יִפָּחֲדוּ for יתפרדו in iv 11 and הִתְפָּרְדוּ for הפחיר[1] in iv 14. Against this it can be urged (i) that התפרד is parallel to אבר again in Ps. xcii 10 (where he unreasonably stigmatizes it as a textual error) and (ii) the Syriac version, having ܐܬܒܕܪ in both places, may imply the same Hebrew verb in both places. The author's objection that to be 'scattered abroad' (R. V.) would be no great misfortune for young lions may be true; but it can be met by supposing that they were so young as still to need the parent-lions to feed them, in which case an admirable sense can be given to יתפרדו by referring it to the √פרד 'alone' (cp. Arab. استفرد 'sought solitude'), so that the line may be translated: 'the whelps of the lioness are left in solitude', i. e. are bereft of their parents and left to starve. The same rendering 'shall be isolated' will also yield a suitable sense in Ps. xcii 10. If this interpretation of v 11 is accepted, it remains only to justify הפחיר 'made to shake' in v 14; the analogous use of נבהל 'was vexed' in regard to bones in Ps. vi 3 is surely sufficient for the purpose, as Gray shews.[2] The author, in fact, cites a number of German works which he has consulted; but he seems to have overlooked Gray's work. For example, he proposes in iii 14 to read קְבָרוֹת למו for חברות למו; but he ignores the fact that Cheyne proposed קִבְרוֹת למו long ago, as Gray states. Again, Gray fully meets his objections to יצא and שער in xxix 7; for he shews that שער can be used of the doors of private dwellings[3] and that יצא can be used with the accusative of the place out of which one goes,[1] nor is there any reason why Job's house should not have had a gate.

---

[1] The reading הפפכדו seems, from what precedes, to be a misprint.

[2] S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray *Job* p. 45.

[3] Cf. Prov. xiv 19; Jud. xviii 16, 17.

It is, however, hardly possible to pass a general judgement on a number of disconnected notes; each suggestion must be examined and weighed on its own merits. The rearrangements are often by no means unhappy, but in some of the emendations the *ductus literarum* seems to have been completely neglected; nor does the author ever attempt to explain how the supposed errors have come into the text. Again, to stamp a phrase as *Hyperbel* or *pointelos* is essentially subjective; nor must it be forgotten that what seems hyperbolic or without point to us may not have seemed so to an ancient Hebrew, and the most surprising or least expected is often the true explanation of an Oriental text. Further, in view of the limited vocabulary with which we are acquainted, extensive restoration of a Hebrew text is something hazardous, like fitting together a puzzle from which not a few parts are missing. This is not to say that none or only a few of the suggestions contained in this work are of value—far from it; but it is *a priori* unlikely that a large proportion of them, however neat or clever, either are right or are even likely to commend themselves to the majority of scholars.

Geschichte des Volkes Israel: 3. Band, 1. Hälfte, by R. KITTEL. (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1927.)

IN a previous review the writer expressed the hope that Professor Kittel would continue his excellent *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, which he had then brought down to the fall of Jerusalem and the Babylonian captivity. The present work, which is the first part of the long-desired third volume, begins with the Exile and goes down to the conflict of the Persians with the Greeks. Our knowledge of the facts of Jewish history during this period is slight, compared with the period of the kings; but Professor Kittel duly puts on record what is known, while devoting himself especially to full and accurate description of the political and spiritual condition of the Jews during these years, in which he pays equal attention to the remnant left behind in Palestine and to those who were carried off to Babylon. As interesting as it is important is his careful estimate of the external influences with which the Jews came into contact. In the first place, the opening and concluding chapters contain a sketch of contemporary Babylonian and Persian history; and secondly there are careful accounts of Greek, Egyptian, and Babylonian, as well as of Iranian, philosophy and religion in so far as they touch on Jewish thought and practice. The tribes and peoples too, who come into closer contact with the Jews in the Biblical narratives, such as the Calebites, Edomites, Ammonites, Nabateans, and so on, receive due treatment. The bulk of the book, however, is naturally occupied with the great figures of the Exilic period, Ezechiel (about whom the author is no blind follower of Hölscher) and the second Isaiah. Of other literary works which he discusses the chief are Deuteronomy and the Book of Judges, in both of which the purpose of the compilers in his opinion is not the writing of a scientific history but the encouragement of their oppressed countrymen.

---

[1] Cf. Exod. ix 29, 33; Num. xxxv 26.

The printing is clearer and the paper better than in the preceding volumes, and the book seems remarkably free from misprints. The few which the reviewer has noticed may perhaps be recorded against the publication of another edition: on p. 9, n. 2, ἀσέλγως for ἀσελγῶς; on p. 47, l. 34, *el-ḥadīte* for *el-ḥadīṯe*; on p. 50, l. 26, 'Qe īla' for 'Qeʿīla'; on p. 75, l. 1, 'Zor a' for 'Zorʿa' and l. 10, 'Je arim' for 'Jeʿarim'; on p. 275, n. 4, '1194' for '1914'; on p. 279, l. 35, 'Nobonid' for 'Nabonid'. Perhaps, too, an English scholar may regret that Professor Kittel still refers to the old and partial editions of the Egyptian Aramaic papyri by Sachau (1911) and Ungnad (1911) instead of Cowley's far more convenient edition (1923). These, however, are small blemishes in a work on which both the author and the publishers are to be heartily congratulated. The absence of any other work dealing with the history of the people of Israel on the same scale makes it indispensable to all students of the Old Testament, who will join the reviewer in wishing him *Leben und Gesundheit* to bring his long task to a happy conclusion.

G. R. Driver.

Synopsis Evangelica, by M.-J. Lagrange, O.P., with the assistance of C. Lavergne, O.P. (Barcinone, apud 'Editorial Alpha', via Laietana 30, MCMXXVI), is a stately volume in which the Greek text of the four Gospels is given in order of sections based on the principle that Luke and John represent most accurately the actual chronology of the life and history of Jesus.

The order of Luke is followed all through in the synopsis, and passages from John and the other evangelists are inserted in supplement of the matter which Luke supplies, but a few passages both in Luke and in John are judged to be out of their chronological order, and these are marked as such and inserted in the place to which M. Lagrange would assign them. Thus, for example, we do not have two cleansings of the Temple, nor two rejections at Nazareth—the chronological order of John in the one case and of Mark and Matthew in the other being preferred.

M. Lagrange has already published translations and full commentaries on all the Gospels, and he refers to these in justification of his chronology and of such readings in the text as he adopts in doubtful cases, citing at the foot of the page the variants of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, von Soden and Vogels, and including in his text within brackets readings represented in the Latin Vulgate though generally rejected (e. g. Lk. ix 55^b). M. Lagrange commends his work, in contrast with other synopses, as being the work of a Catholic, and the students he has in view are to be congratulated on the handsome form in which he presents it to them.

In a handy volume, *Synopse des Quatre Évangiles* (Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda et Fils, 1927), M. Lavergne gives a French translation of the Gospels in the same order, with indexes and tables, and a few notes at the foot of the page. The translation is that of M. Lagrange in his special editions of the four Gospels, and the notes—which are explanatory of difficulties and calculated to reassure and to direct the reader's religious life—are mainly based on M. Lagrange's commentaries.

More in keeping with the scientific lines on which study of the Gospels is generally pursued in England and America is *The Student's Gospels* by Shailer Mathews (University of Chicago Press, 1927—for England, Cambridge University Press, 5*s.* net), intended for popular use. The sections are those of the new edition of Burton and Mathews *Life of Christ*, and the text is that of E. J. Goodspeed's *American Translation.* The Gospel according to St John is printed by itself, after the others in three columns, under the title 'The Christ interpreted by Christian experience'. The paragraph headings are throughout less formal than in some synopses and suggest more readily the chief contents of the different sections. In the translation, as far as I have tested it, there is nothing to offend, while there is freshness to attract, and the volume as a whole may be heartily recommended to English readers.

Here may be welcomed also a reprint of the Rheims (commonly known as the Douai) version of the New Testament (one of 'The Orchard Books', Burns, Oates Washbourne, 1926). The English text is 'given exactly as it stands in the first edition—Rheims, 1582—the only changes being the use of modern spelling and punctuation'. The rest of the contents of the first edition of the book, arguments and voluminous and controversial annotations and the like, are not reprinted, except a shortened glossary and a short selection of the annotations.

The editor, Dom G. R. Hudleston, has provided an admirable Introduction of twenty-four pages. The price of the book is five shillings.

In *Peter, Prince of Apostles* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1927), Dr Foakes Jackson carries on his long series of books on the Bible and the history of the Church, and this time he takes a subject which has not been handled in the same way before. Articles in Dictionaries of the Bible have indicated most of the materials, but it has been reserved for Dr Foakes Jackson to produce out of them a life of St Peter which scholars and laymen alike will read with interest and profit. 'We are amazed to discover', he writes, 'that so little real information has survived regarding the man whom Jesus chose as the leader of the Twelve Apostles'; 'his whole career is romance'. 'In a sense there is not one; there are many Peters. There is the Peter of the Gospels . . .; the Peter of the Acts . . .; the Peter of the Papacy; the Peter as he appears to-day. His story is in fact the history of Christianity, not of its theology, so much as of its activity, its authority, its influence on the mind of man.' It is with this wide view of his subject before him that Dr Foakes Jackson brings his learning to bear on the detailed studies he gives us of Peter in the New Testament, in the Clementine Literature, in apocryphal Acts, and in the historical tradition; and his book is full of fresh and illuminating pictures and comments.

A Modern Confirmation Manual, by the Rev. H. K. Luce, with preface by the Head Master of Harrow (A. & C. Black, 1927), seems to me to be admirably conceived and carried out. Mr Luce's experience has been with public school boys of fourteen to sixteen, but he has avoided appealing to one class of candidate only. Any teacher who wants to put before young people a statement of religious faith which lays stress on the duty of searching for the truth and on the close connexion between religion and everyday life will find in this book what he wants. The chapters on the Apostles' Creed, the Commandments, Prayer, and the Holy Communion give excellent instruction, and the earlier chapters (on the offering of life, Jesus the pattern, and the fellowship of Love) put the deep things of religion in a simple form that should grip and hold attention.

Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion, by James Y. Simpson, D.Sc., Professor of Natural Science in New College, Edinburgh (Hodder & Stoughton, 1925), has the same kind of value and attractiveness that characterize the author's earlier book *Man and the Attainment of Immortality*, noticed in this JOURNAL vol. xxiv p. 463. The monumental work of A. D. White, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896, reprints to 1926), remains the most comprehensive treatment of the subject in all its aspects, and J. W. Draper's *The Conflict between Religion and Science*, first published in 1874, still has its value as a short sketch written at a time when the conflict was felt acutely. But the polemical tone of these two books, which was inevitable when they were written, is a little old-fashioned now, and Dr Simpson's more balanced account may well replace them for most students, especially as he has chapters dealing with more recent movements of thought and aspects of the subjects both of Religion and of Science which have more living interest to-day. For this reason he was perhaps well advised to keep the term 'Religion' in his title, though it seemed to me that Mr White's book represented an advance in the right direction in that he treated the conflict as one between Science and, not Religion but, the theological system which was elaborated in the framework of a Science now generally discarded.

Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres, edidit Ernestus Diehl (Weidmann, Berlin), the twelve parts of which have been appearing during the last three years, is one of the fruits of learning and infinite pains for which students whose path is made easy by them are not always as grateful as they should be. The author's plan has been, out of the many published collections of Latin Inscriptions to the beginning of the seventh century, to make a selection of those that are of importance from the point of view of Christian antiquities and history or illustrate the Latinity of the period. The two volumes of some 500 pages each are now completed, and the editor promises a Supplement with inscriptions discovered and published during the last five years.

Another book to which students of history have been indebted since its first appearance in 1901 is Carl Mirbt's *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*. Of this great collection of sources the fourth edition described as 'verbesserte und wesentlich vermehrte' (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1924) should have been welcomed earlier in this JOURNAL. The fresh matter, which runs to some ten sheets, is distributed over all periods, but especially concerns the position of the Papacy and Catholicism in the period of the Great War and the years immediately succeeding it. The documents contained in these pages add greatly to the well-recognized value of the book.

J. F. B-B.

The Old Testament. An American translation. Edited by J. M. Powis Smith. (University of Chicago Press, 1927.)

The work has been carried out by four Professors—A. R. Gordon of Montreal, T. J. Meek of Toronto, L. Waterman of the University of Michigan, and J. M. Powis Smith, the editor of Micah, Zephaniah, and Nahum in the I. C. C. The books have been distributed among the translators, each being primarily responsible for his own work, and free to employ his own style. The editor has made only 'a few suggestions' to his helpers. As regards style he writes, 'The content of the Old Testament is, with little exception, upon a high literary plane. The language of the translation, therefore, cannot be allowed to fall to the level of the street.' The work is printed like a modern book in paragraphs, and with the use of inverted commas.

A few specimens may be given to illustrate the nature of translation, the translator's name being added, and a second version (where necessary) for comparison.

(*a*) Gen. iv 8. Then Cain said to his brother Abel, 'Let us go off into the country'. When they were out in the country, Cain attacked his brother Abel, and murdered him. (T. J. Meek, following the Samaritan text.)

But Cain quarrelled with his brother Abel, and, when they were out in the open country, Cain attacked his brother Abel and killed him. (Moffatt, following a conjectural emendation.)

(*b*) Gen. v 24. Enoch walked with God, and then he disappeared; for God took him away. (T. J. Meek.)

Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him. (R.V.)

(*c*) Deut. xviii 18. From time to time I will raise up for them some one like you from among their fellow-countrymen to be a prophet; I will put my oracles in his mouth. . . . (T. J. Meek: a good paraphrase.)

I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee; and I will put My words in his mouth. . . . (Jewish Version (1917).)

(*d*) 1 Kings xviii 21. 'How long are you going to limp upon two diverse opinions?' (L. Waterman: a good paraphrase.)

How long halt ye between two opinions? (A.V. and R.V.)

(*e*) Job xix 25–27:

But I know, my Vindicator lives
And hereafter he will rise up upon the dust;
And after my skin has been torn off,—like this,—
And from my flesh I shall see God;

Whom I shall see on my side,
And my eyes will see unestranged,
My emotions are spent within me! (Powis Smith.)

(*f*) Eccl. xii 3, 8:

In the day when the guardians of the house tremble,
And the strong men are bent,
And the grinding-maids cease because they are few,
And the ladies peering through the windows be darkened . . .
Futility of futilities, says Koheleth, all is futility.
(Powis Smith.)

(*g*) Isa. i 13:

Bring no more worthless offering!
Foul smoke it is to me.
New moon and sabbath, the holding of assemblies—
Fasting and festival I cannot endure. (A. R. Gordon.)

Bring no more vain oblations;
Incense is an abomination unto me;
New moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies,—
I cannot away with iniquity and the solemn meeting.
(R. V.)

It is perhaps strange that the translators have not seen that the common word מלחמה 'war' or 'battle' has sometimes a concrete sense and should be rendered 'army' or 'battle-array'. Thus in 1 Kings xxii 35, 'The *army* went up', i. e. The Israelites retreated from the battle into which they had *gone down* (cf. 1 Sam. xxvi 10); Ps. xlvi 9, '(JEHOVAH) destroyeth *armies*' (*not* 'maketh wars to cease'); Ps. lxxvi 3, 'There brake he . . . the shield and the sword and the *battle-array*'; Joel iii 9 (iv 9), 'Sanctify the warriors' (*not* 'Hallow war', as Prof. Powis Smith).

The translation as a whole invites comparison with Dr Moffatt's (one-volume edition). It is less colloquial in style. The Hebrew text is corrected with moderation, and with due use of the LXX and other Versions. The Prophetic and Poetic books are well supplied with headings inserted in the text. In the Pentateuch there is no distinction of sources, as in Dr Moffatt's translation. This is a book which an English reviewer leaves with mixed feelings. For him there are too many colloquial expressions, though a real effort has been made to preserve dignity of style. Here it may be said that the book of Job is a specimen of dignified translation. The work as a whole should be really helpful to the ordinary reader, and the scholar should be grateful for much that is to be found here. No Apocrypha are included.

W. EMERY BARNES.

The Law of the Lord's Day in the Celtic Church, by Donald Maclean, D.D. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1926.)

No Puritan body was ever more strictly Sabbatarian than the ancient Celtic Church. The valuable documents which we possess relating to the life and the rules of the Monastery of St Mael-Ruain, at Tallaght, near Dublin, teach us that even to pick up a fallen apple on a Sunday was forbidden: that offerings of food made by benefactors which happened to arrive on a Sunday might not be used by the inmates, but were to be distributed to the poor: that to take a bath on the preceding Saturday night was accounted a desecration of the Sabbath, to be atoned for by penances. Other illustrations of the same fact, quoted from hagiology, are given in the book before us.

This book is primarily a translation of the well-known text *Cáin Domnaig*, or Law of the Lord's Day, which has been printed but not previously translated. It is a most remarkable document, and is so thoroughly in the spirit and style of the native jurists of Ireland that it cannot but be of native Irish origin. There is not a trace of foreign influence: and its character, as well as its high antiquity, to which its language bears abundant testimony, raises the interesting question of how far the developement of the sanctity of the Christian Sabbath may be due to Irish influence. That this influence, mediated by Irish pilgrims and teachers, was very considerable is persuasively shewn by Prof. Maclean in his short but most suggestive study.

The Early Monastic Schools of Ireland, their Missionaries, Saints, and Scholars, by W. G. Hanson. (Cambridge, Heffer's, 1927.)

Lectures are not very satisfactory means of imparting instruction. They are subject to rigid time-limitations: and they are of necessity expressed in language simpler than is permissible in a book, over which the reader can spend as long time as may be necessary to master it. It may indeed be questioned whether popular lectures do not, on the whole, do more harm than good, in that they disseminate a cheaply acquired, superficial knowledge, which is a poor substitute for the real thing.

In preparing lectures for the press it is always advisable to replace the time-limitation of the spoken word by the space-limitation of the printed page: pruning here, expanding and re-distributing the material there. Long quotations, where necessary, have to be read at length in a lecture: in the book a simple reference, or at most a *précis*, is all that is necessary. In the book before us much space could thus have been saved and applied to more useful purposes—as, for instance, in emphasizing the great importance of Clonmacnois, which is treated very summarily. Some of the authors quoted (such as 'Fiona MacLeod') are worthless as authorities.

The book does not, however, pretend to be more than an introduction to a vast and complex subject. The scholarship, and the missionary zeal, of the Early Church in Ireland is one of the most extraordinary phenomena in the Church History of Europe. It has attracted some attention, but no *complete* monograph has yet been written. It would be found almost as far-reaching in its ramifications as a complete monograph on the Crusaders would be.

The four lectures which form Mr Hanson's book are written pleasantly, with knowledge and enthusiasm, and though not professing to contain anything particularly new, are of value as indicating the importance of this strange chapter in the history of the Church. It would be ungracious to dwell upon the few faults that we have noted in a book written with such obvious zeal: they are mostly trifling misprints or oversights of comparatively small importance. On p. 13 'Builhe' should be 'Buite'. On p. 17 it should not have been said that the *Book of Armagh* (a purely literary manuscript) in places surpasses the *Book of Kells* in its decoration, or that its Latin text is 'freely interspersed' with Old Irish. On p. 91 the accented and unaccented *e*'s in the word printed 'Celidhé' should change places.

I note a slight but regrettable tendency to hearken to the voices of some who are at the present time seeking to minimize the debt which Scotland owes to Ireland—a debt even greater than that of which St Paul gently reminded Philemon, for it includes not only her soul, but her ancient Celtic speech, with its wealth of folk-lore and literature, and the greater part of her ancient sculptured art. In this unthankful manifestation of a *Sinn Féin* spirit even Columba himself has not escaped detractors!

The fourth lecture, on Erigena, appears to me the best. It is an excellent introduction to the study of the life and work of this extraordinary man.

R. A. S. MACALISTER.

RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

(1) ENGLISH.

The Church Quarterly Review, October 1927 (Vol. cv, No. 209: S.P.C.K.). F. HEILER A Lutheran view of Anglo-Catholicism—N. E. E. SWANN The politics of Dante—T. A. LACEY Original Sin and the Fall—S. ADDLESHAW Modern novels and Christian morals—E. F. SMITH John Keble and the centenary of *The Christian Year*—BISHOP IN NORTH CHINA China and the World Call: a reply to the Rev. R. O. Hall—W. K. L. CLARKE Some old books III: Eighteenth-century piety—C. GARDNER The religion of William Blake—Reviews—Short Notices.

The Hibbert Journal, October 1927 (Vol. xxvi, No. 1: Constable & Co.). THE EDITOR The Hibbert Journal 1902–1927—R. G. COLLINGWOOD Reason is faith cultivating itself—C. H. HERFORD William Blake—D. STRÖMHOLM Was the Gospel narrative known to the authors of the Epistles?—W. L. SPERRY The relation of religion to historical fact—J. L. STOCKS The limits of purpose—J. BAILLIE 'Happiness' once more—U. K. WRIGHT Richard Wright, Unitarian missionary (1764–1836)—J. N. FARQUHAR Achievements of the Indian mind—B. W. BACON The elder of Ephesus and the elder John—H. C. DENT The backbone of education is the elementary school—F. CLARKE An elementary-secondary school—F. BALLARD The revision of hymnology—Survey and Signed Reviews.

(2) AMERICAN.

The Harvard Theological Review, July 1927 (Vol. xx, No. 3: Harvard University Press). M. DIBELIUS The structure and literary character of the Gospels—C. BONNER Traces of thaumaturgic technique in the Miracles.

October 1927 (Vol. xx, No. 4). G. LA PIANA Foreign groups in Rome during the first centuries of the Empire.

The Princeton Theological Review, October 1927 (Vol. xxv, No. 4: Princeton University Press). J. G. MACHEN The integrity of the Lucan narrative of the Annunciation—J. O. BOYD Echoes of the Covenant with David—O. A. MARTI Popular protest and revolt against papal finance in England from 1226 to 1258—A. J. WILSON The sign of the prophet Jonah and its modern confirmations—C. H. FENN Is Christianity responsible for China's troubles?—Reviews.

(3) BELGIAN.

Analecta Bollandiana, October 1927 (Vol. xlv, Nos. 3 and 4: Brussels, 24 Boulevard Saint-Michel). F. LANZONI Il sogno presago della madre incinta nella litteratura medievale e antica—P. PEETERS Saint Thomas d'Émèse et la Vie de sainte Marthe—H. DELEHAYE Hagiographie et archéologie romaines (*suite*): II Le sanctuaire des Apôtres sur la voie Appienne: III De quelques publications récentes—H. DELEHAYE Les lettres d'indulgence collectives (*suite*): IV Les lettres collectives du XIV^e siècle (*à suivre*)—M. COENS Notes sur la légende de S. Hubert—Bulletin des publications hagiographiques.

Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, October 1927 (Vol. xxiii, No. 4). P. BATIFFOL La liturgie du sacre des évêques dans son évolution historique—L. GOUGAUD Étude sur l'*Ordo monasticus* de Culross—D. DE BRUYNE Encore l'*Itala* de S. Augustin—J. VAN MIERLO, jun. Les béguines et Lambert li Beges—F. CLAEYS-BOUUAERT L'opposition de quelques évêques belges à la bulle *In Eminenti* (6 mars 1642), d'après des documents inédits—Comptes rendus—Chronique et Tables—Bibliographie et Tables.

(4) GERMAN.

Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, December 1927 (Vol. xxvi, Nos. 2-4: A. Töpelmann, Giessen). A. H. SALONIUS Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente des Neuen Testaments in den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin—W. E. CRUM Die koptische Uebersetzung des Lebens Symeons des Styliten—L. BRUN Die römischen Kaiser in der Apokalypse—E. HIRSCH Noch einmal: Die Bibelrevision—E. LOHMEYER Probleme paulinischer Theologie—C. CLEMEN Die Stellung der Offenbarung Johannis im ältesten Christentum—B. W. BACON The elder John in Jerusalem—H. WINDISCH Die Verstockungsidee in Mc. 4 12 und das Kausale ἵνα der späteren Koine—J. SYKUTRIS Ein neues Papiaszitat—J. N. B. VAN DEN BRINK Eine Paradosis zu der Leidensgeschichte—F. BÜCHSEL Mandäer und Johannesjünger—A. MARMORSTEIN Iranische und jüdische Religion, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Begriffe 'Wort', 'Wohnen', und 'Glorie' im iv Evangelium und in der rabbinischen Literatur—H. LIETZMANN Notizen.

Theologische Quartalschrift (Vol. cviii, No. 3: H. Laupp, Tübingen). CHR. BAUR Chrysostomus in Genesim—GEISELMANN Christus und die Kirche nach Thomas von Aquin—Besprechungen.

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

APRIL, 1928

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE MANDAEANS[1]

THE *Mandæan Studies* of Dr S. A. Pallis were first published in 1919 in Danish: he has now brought out a second edition in English, which demands very careful consideration from every one interested in the still existing religion of the Mandaeans. There has been lately a revival of interest in this curious faith, partly perhaps because so many British army men came across Mandaeans in Kut and other places on the banks of the Tigris, but still more from the fact that M. Lidzbarski brought out a German translation of the *Johannesbuch* in 1915 and of the *Ginza rabba* in 1925. Before this one had to use the transcript of the Paris MS by Petermann (1867), or the pre-scientific edition of Norberg (1815–1816) in which the Mandaean text was conjecturally 'restored' into a sort of Syriac.

The Mandaeans live on the banks of the Tigris. They must live near running water where they can practise their continual baptismal rites. When they were first discovered by Europeans in the 17th century, and it was found that they were neither Catholics nor Protestants but that they made much of baptism and honoured John the Baptist, they were called Christians of St John, in the belief that they were a direct survival of the Baptist's disciples. Further research, however, made it quite clear that they were not Christians or Jews at all, in any ordinary sense of the word. They regard 'Jesus Messiah' as a false prophet, and 'the Holy Spirit' as a female demon, and they denounce the Jews and all their ways. The language in which their sacred books are written is akin to Syriac, and seems to represent the Aramaic current in lower Babylonia. The gutturals have disappeared, very much as in the old Babylonian language, now familiar to us from cuneiform tablets.

---

[1] *Ginza . . . das Grosse Buch der Mandäer*, übersetzt von Mark Lidzbarski. (Göttingen, 1925.) *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer*, von Mark Lidzbarski. (Giessen, 1905–1915.) *Mandæan Studies*, by Svend Aage Pallis. (Milford, London, 1926.)

It is very likely that the Mandaeans are physically descended from the old Babylonians, and it would cause no surprise if their anti-Christian, anti-Moslem religion had been found to be a survival of the old religion of Babylonia. As a matter of fact, it is nothing of the kind. It is bitterly opposed to the astrology into which late Babylonian religion developed. The Mandaean mythology is partly without near parallels in other known systems, partly occupied with beings whose names, often in slightly different forms, occur in the Old and New Testaments. What then is the spiritual ancestry of these people? From whence did they derive their ideas, whether by way of inheritance, or of repulsion? It is with this question that Dr Pallis's book is concerned.

Dr Pallis begins by emphasizing the heterogeneous character of the Mandaean writings, in order to make it clear that their religious ideas must have been derived from several sources. This indeed is generally acknowledged, but there are two main and incompatible explanations. The one regards Mandaism as essentially an Eastern-Oriental religion, whose connexion with Christianity is more or less superficial; the other regards it as an immigrant into Mesopotamia from the West, as a Gnostic system coeval with Christianity, if not older, as parallel to Christianity, as a product of late-Jewish speculation, and so possibly containing elements from which certain features of Christianity are actually derived. This latter theory is the modern version of the old idea that the Mandaeans are the degenerate descendants of disciples of John the Baptist, and it sometimes takes the form of theories that the Gospel of 'John' (or some parts of it) is to be regarded as a Christian version of a work about John the Baptist, traces of which, including the figure of the Good Shepherd, are said to be recognizable in the Mandaean sacred books! It is this group of theories that has excited during the last few years a certain popular interest in Mandaism.

It was necessary to point this out, but very little of it finds an echo in Dr Pallis's sober pages. He begins by discussing the alleged dependence of Mandaism on ancient Babylonian religion (as maintained by Brandt and others), and shews that there is little evidence for it. Some superstitious survivals of ancient 'Babylonian' customs may be traced among Mandaean women, but not as a part of the Mandaean doctrine (p. 14 ff: see Herodotus i 199). Further, to the Babylonians this world was a good place, the work of beneficent deities; to Mandaeans it was on the whole an evil place, the work of demons. To the Babylonians death was a terror, and the dead (like Homer's heroes) live on in the gloomy desolate underworld from whence there is no return; to Mandaeans death is a release, at least for the righteous and enlightened man, whose spirit flies up through the spheres to the realm of pure light and cannot be detained on the way by Fate or the Demons of the

Planets.[1] That the Mandaeans regard the North as the best part and the upper part, the home of good beings, was almost inevitable, seeing that, as the *Ginza* itself points out,[2] the indispensable and cleansing waters come from that quarter. It is worth remark that the Manichees also, who arose in Babylonia, regarded the burning South as the bad quarter. Surely in such a matter climate and topography count for more than mythological tradition.

Pallis's chap. III deals with the Persian elements in Mandaism: we may note the reserves with which he formulates his conclusion on p. 68. But by way of passing on to consider his chap. IV, which deals with Judaism and the Old Testament in Mandaean writings, let us consider the 'Persian names of divine beings or religious conceptions' that we find in them. Dr Pallis notes seven (pp. 104–114). The first is *zīwā* 'splendour', which as he acknowledges is found in most Aramaic dialects, including Syriac. The second is *parwānḳā*, a sort of guardian spirit[3]: this word occurs in the very same sense in the 'Hymn of the Soul', line 16 *b*, i. e. in the masterpiece of the old classical Syriac literature. The third is the demon *Gew* mentioned in G R v, and also in the *Shāhnāmā*, but (to quote Dr Pallis, p. 105) 'as the two Mandaean passages merely mention his name we have no means to decide whether more than this is Persian'. The fourth is *Javar* (*Yawar*), which does seem to be the Persian 'friend' or 'helper', a by-name for *Mandā d'Ḥayyē* or of *Hibil*: this word is no doubt of Persian etymology. Similarly the use of the name 'Bihram, the great one', in a Mandaean baptismal formula (in *Qolasta*, the Mandaean Hymn-book) is the use of a Persian name, but Dr Pallis points out that there is reason to believe that this name was only introduced at a comparatively late period.

'Far greater problems are offered by *mānā*, one of the most prominent cosmological primeval beings in G R vi and viii' (Pallis, p. 107): *mana* also means the cult-garment in which baptism is received. But as Dr Pallis arrives at the conclusion that all the Mandaean meanings of *mana* come ultimately from the meaning 'garment', which it also has in ordinary Syriac, it does not really illustrate the Persian element in Mandaism.

Finally Dr Pallis discusses the derivations proposed by Brandt and by Prof. Andreas for *Abatur*, and shews that each has philological reasons against it: his conclusion is that 'the name *Abatur* has absolutely no relation to the Iranian languages and that the figure only secondarily became influenced by Persian elements of religion (the judgement and the balance)'.[1]

---

[1] The names of the Planets and of the Signs of the Zodiac (*malwāshē*) seem to be regarded by Dr Pallis as ultimately Babylonian. Ultimately perhaps: but it should have been pointed out on p. 20 that the Mandaeans simply use the well-known Syriac names, commonly ascribed by Syrians to Bardaiṣan. On p. 20, note 4, Dr Pallis has quoted the Signs in the wrong order: Wright *CBM* 1215, in agreement with G R 379, has *Embra*, *Taura*, &c.

[2] G R 282^{26}.

[3] See especially *Johannesbuch* 120^{2}.

We come then to the Biblical elements in Mandaism; from whence are they derived? Dr Pallis's chapter on Judaism in Mandaean writings (pp. 115–150) seems to me decisive, one of the most important in the book. He does not believe that there is any direct connexion between Mandaism and Judaism: 'the Mandaeans have made no distinction between Jews and Christians, or rather when they speak of *Yahūṭayyē*[2] . . . they always think of the Christians and call them by this name' (p. 141).[3] Moreover, Dr Pallis goes on to say, their ideas were confused by the fact that the Old Testament was a holy book of the Christians. I even venture to suggest that Dr Pallis does not go far enough, and that a closer examination of the vocabulary of the Syriac Bible (the Peshiṭta) shews that the Mandaeans got their ideas about these things from the scriptures of the Syriac Christians, i. e. from the Bible as current in Mesopotamia and not as current in the Mediterranean lands.[4] Words like *rḳiha*, *shiul*, *tibil*, are Mandaean transliterations of the Peshiṭta terms ܪܩܝܥܐ, ܫܝܘܠ, ܬܒܝܠ: there is no need to go to the Hebrew original for them, while their Greek equivalents, such as Gnostics in Greek-speaking lands would have used, are *στερέωμα*, *ᾅδης*, *ἡ οἰκουμένη*.

On one point surely Dr Pallis is wrong. The Mandaeans call all fresh running water, in which one can be baptized, 'Jordan'. Opposed to this is the pernicious sea in which the wicked perish which they call 'Suf, the Sea' (G L 55^{6}), or 'the Sea of Suf' (*iamā d'suf*, G R 368^{3}), or 'the Great Sea of Suf'. It is clear from the transposition in G L 55^{5} that 'Suf' is a proper name, not an appellative. Lidzbarski, following Norberg and others, regards this as derived from ים סוף, the Hebrew name for the Red Sea, but Pallis prefers to think that *suf* has nothing to do with this. When, however, it is noticed that the Syriac for the Red Sea is ܝܡܐ ܕܣܘܦ (*yamā dsof*), it is clear not only that the corresponding Mandaean term does mean 'Red Sea', but also that it is derived from the Syriac Bible, not the Hebrew original.[5] The term, it need hardly be added, is always used in a mythological sense, for of the real topography of Palestine and Egypt the Mandaeans clearly know nothing.

---

[1] Pallis p. 114.

[2] Mandaean distortion of *Yahūdayyē*, distorted to suggest 'abortions' and 'sinners'.

[3] Note that Lidzbarski himself remarks about a Mandaean protest against the use of trumpets in worship: 'danach vermute ich, dass der Verfasser Jüdisches und Christliches durcheinander geworfen hat' (*Johannesbuch* p. 104 note 2).

[4] For an argument that the Mandaean poem which is based on Psalms cxiv and xxix (G R 174 f) derives its imagery from the Peshiṭta alone, see the separate Note.

[5] Strictly speaking, it might come of course from the Jewish Targums, which agree letter for letter here with the Syriac.

Of the six proper names which Pallis collects as implying 'a more accurate knowledge of the Old Testament' (p. 122) it should be noted that they all occur in the Peshiṭta. *Tanīnā* (dragon) occurs, e. g., in Ps. lxxiv 13 as well as in Gen. i 20, and *Lewiāthān* occurs in Ps. civ 26 and Isa. xxvii 1.[1]

We come now, the ground having been somewhat cleared, to the relation of the Mandaean Religion to Christianity. We ought not to be too much influenced by the fact that to the Mandaeans *Eshu mshiha* (Jesus Christ) is a false prophet, who is also *Nbu*, i.e. Nebo-Hermes, the planet Mercury, or that his mother is *Ruha d'Ḳudsha* (the Holy Spirit), an evil demon who is also *Dlibat*, the planet Venus. We are all in this age of books and diffused education too much influenced by our own personal knowledge of the beginnings of Christianity, derived from our own reading of the New Testament itself, and we tend to think that for those who do not accept the orthodox Church theology there is always the alternative of a sort of modernist, more or less naturalistic, view of Jesus Christ who went about doing good. But for those who are not familiar with the Gospels, who hear of 'Jesus Christ' or 'Holy Spirit' only as the sacred deities of a hostile and persecuting Church, this alternative is not open. And a very little investigation makes it quite clear that the Mandaean hostility to *Eshu mshiha* is hostility to the fully developed post-Nicene Church. In several places 'Christ' is actually called 'the Byzantine' (*Rumaia*), and further we are told that the disciples of this Christ become 'Christians', and turn into monks and nuns who have no children and who keep fasts and never wear white clothes like the Mandaeans (G R ii 55). In a word, it is not the Christ of the Gospels, but the Christ of fully developed ecclesiastical organization and policy to which Mandaism is so hostile.

When were Mandaeans persecuted by Christians? It can only have been during the Sasanian Empire, when Christianity was a more or less tolerated religion, whose head—alone recognized as such by the King of Kings—was the Nestorian Catholicus of Seleucia. The Mandaean Religion, as such, was not recognized by the Persian government: they must have been reckoned as a variety of 'Christians', as in fact they are. '*Amuneil* (i. e. Emmanuel) is his name, *Eshu mahiana* he calls himself, . . . when he oppresses you, tell him "We belong to thee". But in your hearts confess him not, and fall not away from the word of your Lord, the high King of Light' (G R i 28). Surely this reflects a time when Mandaeans were willing to let themselves be formally inscribed as Churchmen, when they were not really such.

---

[1] In Pallis p. 122, l. 12, 'G R vi' is a misprint for G R iii. Why 'Carmel' should be the mount of destruction is clear from the story of Elijah, in which it is a hill where 400 prophets of the foreign God performed their rites and were slaughtered.

Words like *Eshu* and *Amuneil* shew that Mandaean transcriptions of Biblical names are often inaccurate. This is no doubt due to ignorance or (in some cases, as in *Shum* for Shem, i. e. 'name') to the phonetic laws of the Mandaean language. But occasionally their peculiar religious use of names makes the ordinary use of familiar terms impossible, and other words have to be substituted. *Ruha*, as we have seen, is used by the Mandaeans exclusively for the evil spirit, so they no longer use it, as all other Aramaic dialects do, for 'wind': they use *ziḳa* instead, a word which in Syriac means 'storm'. *Alāha* (i. e. God) has to them the meaning 'false god', so for the true Divine Being they use various substitutes such as 'the Great *Māna*' or '*Manda d'Ḥayyē*' (lit. the Knowledge of Life). Similarly 'Jesus Christ' was to the Mandaeans only the Pseudo-messiah worshipped by the official Christians. Had they then a name for the true Jesus? The answer is, yes; they called Him *Anush* or *Enush*. In G R ii 53 and G R i 29 we read that Anush-Utra[1] comes into the world in the days of Piliaṭus (or Palṭus, i. e. Pilate) the king of the world; he heals the sick, makes the blind to see, cleanses the lepers, raises the cripples so that they can walk, and makes the deaf and dumb to speak. With the power of the high King of Light he raises the dead. Those who believe in him among the Jews he teaches that there is Life and Death, Light and Darkness and burning Fire, Truth and Error. Three hundred and sixty Prophets go out of Jerusalem and preach in the name of the Lord of Glory[2]: then Anush-Utra ascends to the Mandaean Paradise and will not be seen again by mankind till the End comes. Before he ascended, however, we read in another place that Anush-Utra will unmask the Deceiver, the Byzantine Christ, who will confess that he is only one of the deceiving Seven Planets: he will be seized by the Jews and crucified (G R ii 58).

That this tale of the preaching and of the miracles of Anush-Utra in Jerusalem is no isolated patch in the Mandaean construction appears from G R xiv 288 f, where true religion is represented as being the doctrine taught by Anush-Utra, and still more from G R xv, where Anush-Utra himself sings of his coming into the world. He calls himself the Stranger (*nukraya*, G R 328, last line) and says: 'I took a bodily form and appeared in Jerusalem. I spoke with my voice and preached, and became a Healer for Miriai: a Healer for Miriai I became, and healed her from head to foot. I was called Healer of the Truth (*kushṭa*), who heals and takes no fee' (G R 331 f).[1] This is followed among other things by the mission of the 365 disciples. Clearly this is a parallel to what we read in G R i and ii, and sets forth the same doctrine.

---

[1] *Utra* (i. e. ܥܘܬܪܐ, lit. wealth, treasure) is the Mandaean name for a good spirit, so that *Anush-Utra* might almost be rendered 'St Enōsh'.

[2] Or 'greatness': it seems to reflect the name used by the Manichees for the Monarch of the realm of Light.

The Mandaeans, then, rejected the Christ of the Catholic Church, born of a woman and crucified, but they accepted the Stranger who appeared in Jerusalem in the days of Pilate, who healed the sick and taught the true and life-giving doctrine, and who ascended in due course when his work was done to his own place in the world of Light. This Personage is called the Stranger, but he is no stranger to the modern student of Christian antiquity: it is clearly the Manichaean Jesus, a personage adopted by Mani from the Jesus of Marcion.[2] In other words it is no new controversial figment of the Mandaeans.

What, meanwhile, did contemporary Churchmen say of the Mandaeans? For this we have to go to the *Scholion* of Theodore bar Konai (A.D. 792).[3] In this work there is a section on the Mandaeans, who are there called Dositheans.[4] Theodore tells us they are called Mandaeans in Mesene, i.e. in Babylonia, but Naṣaraeans in the districts further north. That they really are our Mandaeans is evident from what he subsequently tells us about Abatur (ܐܒܝܬܘܪ, *Abitur*) and Ptaḥil (ܦܬܚܝܠ). 'Dositheans' must be nothing more than a learned nick-name, for Dositheus is the name of a legendary contemporary of Simon Magus, and the Mandaeans themselves know nothing of such a person.

What Theodore says of Mandaism is that its founder was one Ado, a beggar from Adiabene, who had come into Babylonia with companions who all bore names of a Mandaean type,[5] and that the doctrine of the Mandaeans is borrowed from the Marcionites, from the Manichees, and from the Kantaeans or Knāthaeans (ܟܢ̈ܬܝܐ). As for these last,

---

[1] Lidzbarski (*Johannesbuch* p. 125) considers Miriai, the faithful convert and disciple, to have been developed out of Mary the mother of Jesus. Surely she is not that, but a reminiscence of Mary Magdalene (see Lk. viii 2).

[2] Several passages in Ephraim's *Prose Refutations of Marcion* seem to indicate a Marcionite doctrine of two Messiahs, the false and the true: see Mitchell, vol. ii, p. xxxviii, l. 14; p. xlviii, l. 18; p. xlix, l. 24.

[3] *Konai* according to *CUL* Add. 1998 (16th cent.), *Kuni* according to *CUL* Add. 2812 (19th cent.): E. Sachau has suggested that the name was really *Kēwānī* = Saturninus.

[4] See H. Pognon *Coupes de Khouabir* (1898) p. 224 ff.

[5] e.g. *Em-kushṭa*, ܐܡܟܘܫܛܐ, mother of Ado; also Shimlai (*sic*) and Nidbai his brothers: see Lidzbarski, *Johannesbuch* p. xx.

Theodore tells us (p. 220) that the foolish ܕܘܣܬܝ̈ܐ (? = 'associates') say their doctrine comes from Abel (in Syriac ܗܒܝܠ): so do the Mandaeans in part. What Theodore further says about their origin and practices is not enlightening, and in all cases spiteful tales by Church writers about the founders of heresies must be received with suspicion. But I think Theodore's account of the Mandaeans may be reasonably interpreted.

Firstly, the Mandaeans are not immemorial but a sect about the origin of which something is known. There is little need to doubt the existence of Ado. Only we must not import into the word 'beggar' the associations which this word has in modern English. All the Elect among the Manichees were 'beggars', i. e. wandering fakirs without a settled home, who might not possess more than 'food for a day and clothes for a year'. This does not mean that they were uneducated: they might be full of legendary lore and might even be carrying about sacred writings in their pack. At the same time this kind of life is not favourable for the accurate preservation of ancient literature. Of course Ado and his family were not 'orthodox' Manichees or Marcionites, but I do suggest that they stood in relation to these respectable societies in something of the relation that the Fraticelli of the 13th and 14th centuries stood to the true Franciscans. What I mean more particularly is that they had inherited from the Manichees and the Marcionites a Christian tradition parallel to, but very different from, the tradition of the Catholic Church.

The Marcionites in the 5th and 6th centuries were an unlicensed and vanishing society. But they had been once a great factor in the Christianity of the Euphrates Valley, as is clear from the polemics of Ephraim and still more from the influence which they had on the new theology of Mani. I am not suggesting that the Mandaeans are Marcionites: what I am suggesting is that Theodore bar Konai was right when he tells us their doctrines are partly derived from the Marcionites, and I think we can say with confidence that that part is their 'Christology', that Anush-Utra is the Marcionite Jesus.

From Manichaeism the Mandaeans derived their conception of the High King of Light and His glorious and peaceful realm far beyond the heaven and earth of this evil world. His Five good attributes, His seat in the North, and other details, seem to come direct from Mani's presentation of the King of the Paradises of Light. Further, the Mandaean formula of Confession in GR ii 61 ff (especially 63, end) recalls the Manichaean *Khuastuanift*. But the connexion of Mandaism with Manichaeism does not seem to me so intimate as with the religion of Marcion.

In one point, of course, Mandaism differs from the organization both of the Marcionites and the Manichees, in that marriage is not only permitted but commanded. Mandaism further differs from most forms of Christian practice, in that Baptism is not administered once and for all, but is often repeated, as often as required. According to Epiphanius, the Marcionites permitted a second and third baptism. The Mandaean repeated baptism might be reconciled to Marcionite theory as an extension of their custom, and it is noteworthy that particular lustrations are commanded to Mandaeans in connexion both with marriage and cohabitation (G R i 14, and elsewhere).

But of course it would be a hopeless perversion to attempt to derive all Mandaean mythology and praxis from Mesopotamian Marcionite Christianity alone. There is the 'Gnostic' doctrine of the ascent of the soul after its separation from the body through the 'custodies', i. e. guarded frontiers, through which only those provided with the seal acquired in Mandaean baptism can pass. Further there is the peculiar Mandaean mythology—Abatur, Ptahil, Or (or Ur),[1] a series of Demiurgic beings unlike in name and function from anything known elsewhere. These may indeed be of Mesopotamian origin: no one has yet suggested a satisfactory derivation for 'Abatur' or 'Ptahil', who occupy something the same place in the Mandaean system (or rather systems) as Jaldabaoth does in some Western Gnostic systems. It may be noted that 'Crun, the great mountain of flesh', that tries to swallow Hibil-Ziwa (G R 143), seems to be a far-off reminiscence of *Κρόνοσ*, of Saturn, not the planet but the banished father who used to swallow his children and now sits in Tartarus. There is therefore a Greek, i. e. Western, element in Mandaean mythology.

As for what may be called more particularly the 'Gnostic' part, the doctrine that the human soul is imprisoned in an alien, non-redeemable body, from which it escapes at death but even then cannot win its way to its true home outside the spheres which encompass this world, save only if it have assimilated the true knowledge during this life, this also can be traced in the Euphrates Valley in ancient Christian circles, for it is the doctrine of Bardaiṣan. Bardaiṣan was a philosopher, a man of culture and science, as such things were understood in his days, with some astronomical knowledge of his own. So far as his ideas have been transmitted to us, he does not speak of monstrous genii with fantastic forms and names, but of Fate and Free-will, of the Planets, of the Heavenly Powers on the right or the left: what may be called the fairy-tale element is absent. But his mythology does speak of souls hindered at the crossing,[1] and kept in seven Limbos (ܡܚܘ̈ܢܐ),[2] which correspond in intention at least to the Mandaean *maṭṭartas*. Moreover *madd'a* (ܡܕܥܐ), the Syriac word from which *manda* is actually derived, was the name Bardaiṣan gave to the Divine Reason or Gnosis that dwells in man.[3]

---

[1] I should like to suggest that Ur, the demon of Darkness, is a corruption of ὕλη (ܗܘܠܐ), a figment which plays so great a part in Marcionite doctrine.

I venture to think that modern writers about 'the Gnosis' have not always considered that some of the resemblances between some of the very different 'Gnostic' systems may come from a common understanding of the actual facts which ultimately gave rise to the pseudo-science of Astrology, facts that had to be taken account of when once they had been apprehended. The Ptolemaic system, though now antiquated, was in its day up-to-date science, based on actual observation of facts. When 'the meek-eyed Peace . . . came softly sliding Down through the turning sphere' from Heaven, it was really through a series of spheres that she had to pass. The discovery of the regular but independent motion of the Planets was accounted for by the doctrine that they were fixed each in its own sphere, which apparently no other star could penetrate. Heaven therefore was not open as it seemed: it was surrounded by crystal spheres, transparent indeed but impenetrable. Granted that the Soul when released from the Body flew up towards Heaven, how could it get through the spheres on its way home?

My point is that this difficulty presents itself naturally, is a natural question to be asked. It is not wonderful that several systems have a doctrine of 'wards' to be passed, in number corresponding generally with the number of the Planets. Sometimes the stress was laid on past good conduct, sometimes on the possession of secret knowledge: what seemed evident was that some passport was necessary before the soul could read its title clear to mansions in the skies—or rather, beyond the skies. Wherever therefore the doctrine of the 'spheres' was accepted we find doctrines of how to get past them, corresponding in part to old tales of how to pass the fabled rivers of Hades.

In any case, what we know of Bardaiṣan's cosmogony is enough to shew analogies with the substructure underlying the fantastic and complicated Mandaean fairy-tales. The important thing is, that Bardaiṣan belongs to the region of the Euphrates Valley. In the past, I venture to think, too much attention has been given by expositors of Mandaism to sects of Gnostics described by Irenaeus and Hippolytus and Epiphanius and other Western writers. The Mandaeans live in Lower Babylonia. Their sacred writings were compiled some seventy years after the coming of Islam, i. e. not before A.D. 700. Their founder, that is to say, the founder of Mandaism in its present form, according to the only tradition we have, was a wandering ascetic from Adiabene, whose doctrines were partly borrowed from those of the Manichees and the Marcionites, both known to have been influential in Mesopotamia generally. It requires, I venture to say, strong detailed evidence to make it probable that any parts of the system which do not seem to come from Marcionites or Manichees were derived from a Mediterranean source. The Biblical knowledge of the Mandaeans can all be traced to a study of the Peshiṭta, the Bible of the official Christians of Babylonia, including their unsympathetic portrait of Jesus Christ. The Mandaean Anush-Utra, on the other hand, is not a mere pale reflexion of the Church's Jesus Christ, but the Marcionite (and Manichaean) Jesus: all that is said of Anush-Utra, including the figure of Miriai, a queer reminiscence of Mary Magdalene, is ultimately derived from the Lucan Gospel as curtailed and arranged by Marcion.

---

[1] Mitchell, vol. ii, p. lxxvii: see also p. cxxx.

[2] Mitchell, pp. lxxvii and xcvii.

[3] Mitchell, p. lxxiii.

In Bardaiṣan we have an educated Gnostic's doctrine of a modified astrological Fate, including the soul's fate after death. In Mandaism we have a somewhat similar doctrine, as seen through the medium of oral lore and a tradition preserved by wandering mendicants. Even though a feature here and there may be recognized as the lineal descendant of the ancient Gnostic speculation of the age of Valentinus, we cannot expect it to be more faithfully preserved than the features of the Marcionite Jesus are preserved in the Mandaean Anush-Utra. In other words, Mandaism may be interesting in itself, but it is useless to go to it as a key to unlock the mysteries of early Christian developement.

F. C. BURKITT.

NOTE ON GINZA RABBA 174

IN the Ginza Rabba of the Mandaeans (G R 174 f = Lidzbarski 178) there is a poem which deserves special notice, because of its literary connexion with the Old Testament. It is discussed by Dr S. A. Pallis in his excellent *Mandaean Studies* (Oxford, 1926), pp. 131–133, but I think it will be convenient to quote the poem itself from the original and make on it a few observations of my own.

The poem runs thus:

1 Life revealed itself to the world: brightness dawned and light and Life.

2 The sea that saw it retired: and the Jordan turned backwards.

3 The mountains skip like stags: and the hinds in the country damage,

their young: and the hills speak like daughters of the clouds in honour.
4 The mountains open their mouths and give praise: and the cedars in
Lilban are broken.

5 The earth that saw me quivered and trembled: and the king of the
sea that saw me retired.

6 Sea, whom sawest thou and thou retiredst: Jordan, whom sawest
thou and thou turnedst backwards? 7 Mountains, whom saw ye
and ye skipped like stags: and hinds in the field, for whom do ye
damage your young: and hills like daughters of the clouds, for whom
do ye speak in honour? 8 Mountains, for whom did ye open
your mouths in praise: cedars in Lilban, for whom were ye broken?
9 Earth, whom sawest thou and thou didst tremble: king of the sea,
whom sawest thou and thou didst retire? 10 And isles of the
sea, of whom were ye amazed: and islands of the sea, of whom were ye
terrified?

11 Before the brightness and the light of the Gnosis of Life (*Mandā d' Ḥayyē*), and the brightness and the splendour with which Thou hast clothed the men of proved rectitude, &c.

It was necessary to quote the passage almost in full, in order to exhibit its style and structure. Quite clearly it is an imitation or application of Psalm cxiv, which contains also features imitated from Psalm xxix, *vv.* 5 and 9. But it is a free *imitation*, not a quotation or even a paraphrase. We may discover that the Mandaean imitator has misunderstood his original, and thereby we may be able to infer with practical certainty some of the wording of this original, but we are not bound to refer every feature of the new poem to some feature, understood or misunderstood, of the original: a real paraphrase would not have woven the two Psalms together.

This may appear obvious when thus stated, too obvious to be worth formulating. But as a matter of fact it seems to me that this obvious distinction between an imitation and a true paraphrase has not been borne in mind either by Lidzbarski or Dr Pallis, with the result that they bring parallels from the Jewish Targum, which is not likely to have been a source accessible to a Mandaean writer.

Let us see now how far this Mandaean writing can be explained on the most natural supposition of all, viz. that what was known to the writer was the Peshiṭta, that and nothing more. It is acknowledged that 'the king of the sea' comes from the Aramaic *mā lāk yamā* ('what ailed thee, sea?') taken as if it were *mlik yamā*.[1] I may observe that it is not likely to have come from Arabic, for Arabic texts of the Psalms have ما لك ايها البحر, i. e. they insert 'O' before 'sea'.

---

[1] The Mandaeans write א for *a*, so that it is obvious that the mistake was more likely to be made by a Mandaean from the Syriac מא לך ימא, than from the Targum מה לך ימא or the Hebrew מה לך הים.

3 I translate *ailia* 'stags', because the Peshiṭta has *ailē* 'stags': the Jewish Targum has *dakrīn* 'rams'. The hinds and their young come from Psalm xxix 9, but the word used for the verb (משאחמא) is somewhat obscure. It is used in G R 84[19] (Lidzbarski 85[25]), in the passive, of *being convulsed* with sobs. As for √שחט, there seems to be no Syriac evidence for the Hebrew sense of to 'slaughter' (in sacrifice): ܚܰܒܶܠ means to 'damage' or 'spoil'. Granted that Psalm xxix 9 is the original, this Mandaean line does not mean 'maketh the hinds to calve' (as the Jewish Targum): it is really nearer the Peshiṭta which says that the voice of the LORD ܡܙܝܥ, i. e. 'shakes' or 'terrifies', the hinds.

The next clause comes back to Psalm cxiv 4. The 'daughters of the clouds' are derived from another Aramaic blunder. ענא (ܥܢܐ) both in Jewish Aramaic and Syriac means 'flock of sheep', עננא (ܥܢܢܐ) means 'cloud'. The Jewish Targum has בנין דען 'sons of the flock', i. e. masculine, while the Peshiṭta has ܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܕܥܢܐ 'lambs of the flock', also masculine. I venture to suggest that the Peshiṭta is the original from which the Mandaean was excogitated. Granted that there are hills like daughters of clouds (i. e. very high), why should they speak? This cannot be explained out of the Jewish Targum, but the Peshiṭta has

ܘܪ̈ܡܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܕܥܢܐ,

and I suggest that the Mandaean turned this into

ܘܪ̈ܡܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܥܢܢܐ ܐܡܪ̈ܐ,

which he wrongly understood to mean 'and the hills like clouds say'. It is not a question of 'corruption' or 'various reading': the Mandaean text is not an exact translation of anything, but we ask how the queer images came into the writer's head.

'In honour' seems to me to come from Psalm xxix 9.

4 The misspelling 'Lilban' for 'Libnān' does not occur elsewhere in the Ginza (see Lidzbarski 263[27], 409[4]), but is of a piece with the general distortion of Biblical names in Mandaean writings, e.g. 'Enishbai' for 'Elisabeth' (עינישבאי = ܐܠܝܫܒܰܥ).

The rest of the poem, consisting largely of repetitions (as in Psalm cxiv itself), does not need comment: I only quoted it to shew that the literary dependence of the Mandaean writer on the two Psalms is quite clear. It may be remarked that just as 'stags' suggested something to him about 'hinds', so in *ver.* 10 we have 'islands' and 'isles' following the 'sea' and the 'king of the sea'.

Thus the whole poem can be explained from the Peshiṭta, from the Bible current among Christians in Mesopotamia, and from that alone.

F. C. BURKITT.

THE FORM OF A DOVE

IN the accounts of the baptism of Jesus, we read

Matt. iii 16	Mk. i 10	Lk. iii 21, 22	John i 32
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεῴχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί καὶ εἶδεν πνεῦμα Θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν ἐρχόμενον ἐπ’ αὐτόν	εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν	ἐγένετο . . . ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῷ εἴδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ’ αὐτόν	(ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάνης) τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ’ αὐτόν

Mark is clearly primary, and gives us the substance of one of the ‘confidences’ of Jesus to His disciples. The others make each his own attempt to interpret Mark. Matthew explains that *καταβαῖνον* refers to the Spirit, not the motion of the dove; Luke, that it is a vision and not a simile; and John, that the vision revealed Jesus to the Baptist. The substance of Mark is simply a vision seen by Jesus. The closed heaven momentarily opens—are we to visualize this as a flash of light?—and the dove comes winging down to Him. The action is momentary, and passes in the instant in which its significance is grasped. It is the form of a dove that specially challenges comment. Tertullian,[1] followed by Augustine,[2] and finally by Thomas Aquinas,[3] held it to be a momentary creation. The peculiar views of Tertullian on the nature of spirit are involved. He conceived of spirit as having extension in space.[4] The human soul has shape,[5] corresponding in some way to character or personality. Similarly here, the ‘shape’ of the Holy Spirit is more than a symbol. Tertullian calls the church ‘Nostrae columbae domus simplex’.[6] And the phrase is reflected in

---

[1] *De Carne Christi* c. 3 (*M. P. L.* ii 758). ‘Qui Spiritus cum hoc esset, tam vere erat et columba, quam et Spiritus, nec interfecerat substantiam propriam, assumpta substantia extranea. Sed quaeris, corpus columbae ubi sit, resumpto Spiritu in coelum? . . . si non fuit initium visibile, nec finis. Tamen corporis soliditas erat, quo momento corpus videbatur. Non potest non fuisse quod scriptum est.’

[2] *De Agone Christiano* c. 22 (*M. P. L.* xl 302–303). Augustine is not consistent on this point.

[3] *Summa Theologica*, Pars iii, Quaest. 39, Art. 7 (*M. P. L.*, Series II, iv 362–363).

[4] See brief discussion by Tixeront *Histoire des Dogmes* vol. i p. 391.

[5] The *locus classicus* is *De Anima*. See especially c. 7 (*M. P. L.* ii 656–657) and cc. 37, 38 (*M. P. L.* ii 715–716). A Montanist sister *saw* a soul (c. 9).

[6] *Adv. Valentinianos* c. 3 (*M. P. L.* ii 545). A sentence or two earlier Tertullian has said ‘In summa Christum columba demonstrare solita est’, shewing that he knows a current *symbolical* use of the form of a dove, but not for the Third Person. Cf. *Adv. Praxean* c. 27 (*M. P. L.* ii 190).

African Christian iconography. A *dosseret* at Tigzirt shews a single dove seated in a building.[1]

This, however, stands by itself in early Christian iconography, which until the fifth century is dominated by different ideas. One starting-point for these ideas may be sought in the Rabbinic use of the dove as a symbol for Israel.[2] The Church, as the New Israel, realized, in her evangelic mission, the destiny of Israel, and the emblem of the dove was accordingly transferable to her. Roman and Gaulish Christian iconography gives us instances of the dove-symbol that seem to follow such lines, such as twelve doves grouped to face a monogram,[3] symbolizing apparently the apostolate of the Church.

But another and most fruitful starting-point is Noah's dove. It is the messenger of peace, and escape from the wrath of God; in Tertullian's phrase 'A primordio divinae pacis praeco'.[4] This suggests a new Christian symbolism, in which it represents the Church bringing the Gospel of Salvation. We meet continually in monuments dating from the middle of the third century in Rome[5] the iconographic use of the dove as hieroglyphic for σωτηρία. The commonest setting is an orant flanked by doves.[6] In a majority of cases there are olive branches in their beaks, indicating that this iconographic type is governed by the σωτηρία idea.

It appears, therefore, that the principal symbolism of the dove in early Christian times is not the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit symbolism begins with the Montanist Tertullian, and takes the leading place with the emergence of the doctrinal interest in the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. Eventually it displaces the earlier σωτηρία symbolism completely. But it is possible that the *colombe inspiratrice* type, which makes its appearance from the sixth century,[7] owes something to a re-interpretation of old monuments in the light of later ideas, so that a dove in proximity with the orant figure is taken to represent the Holy Spirit inspiring a saint.

---

[1] P. Gavault *Étude sur les ruines Romaines de Tigzirt* p. 31, Fig. 4 (Bibl. d'Arch. Africaine).

[2] H. C. Strack and P. Billerbeck *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* p. 124 sect. (a) of note on Matt. iii 16.

[3] See Martigny *Dict. des Antiquités Chrétiennes*, s. v. Autel, for two examples. Another is in Bottari *Roma Sotterranea* i 118.

[4] *Adv. Valentinianos* c. 2 (*M. P. L.* ii 544). Cf. *De Baptismo* c. 8 (*M. P. L.* i 1208).

[5] For the dating see E. Le Blant *Manuel d'Épigraphie Chrétienne* p. 29. Kirsch in Cabrol *Dict. archéol. chrét.* s.v. *Colombe* dates much earlier. In any case we are dealing with the earliest Christian iconography there is. Kirsch shews that the dove-type conveys a shade of 'Seelenvogel' association.

[6] Particular references seem unnecessary. The type is to be found in almost every collection of early Christian monumental inscriptions.

[7] Molan *Hist. Sanct. Imag.* p. 265.

The point to note is that the Holy Spirit symbolism did not hold the ground from the first.

We return to Tertullian's interpretation of the form of a dove. It held the field in Latin Christendom down to the Reformation, and then the new critical study of Scripture brought a change. Bochart argues that John i 32 disposes of Tertullian's view,[1] because the testimony of the Baptist there recounted would lose its point if the form of a dove was, even temporarily, fully real, since in that case it would have been seen by all persons present. Modern ideas on reality would have parted company with Tertullian in any case.

But on the other hand it is now recognized that human experience affords instances of visual imagery having all the 'given-ness' of objective reality, though without those corroborations which are looked for in that case. There is a correspondence with reality in such visions, but it is with moral reality in the experience of the seer. The visual forms are significant, being intelligible to the seer in terms of ideas already possessed. To persons other than the seer, his vision is instructive just in so far as his thought-world is known. What do we know of the thought-world in which Jesus stands, that may interpret the form of a dove?

The literature of early Jewish piety is of little assistance. Strack and Billerbeck sum up the situation in that respect by saying 'Jedenfalls gibt es in der älteren Literatur keine Stelle, in der die Taube klar und deutlich ein Symbol des heiligen Geistes wäre'.[2]

This does not prove that no such symbolism can have existed. Much connected with Messianism, current at the time of Christ's ministry, is likely to have disappeared from later Rabbinic Judaism, simply because of its Christian associations. But there is reason for thinking that nothing has disappeared that would give a parallel to Mk. i 10. Jewish symbolism approaches the form in question, but with such fundamental difference that it is impossible to regard it as really allied. Thus, when Philo compares the divine Wisdom to a turtle-dove[3] it seems to come near. But his thought is governed by a contrast between the turtle-dove, loving solitude, with the tame dove that affects the busy haunts of men. The possibility of his being acquainted with the dove as a symbol of the Holy Spirit is practically excluded. Other examples of the same thing could be produced. And it seems safe to say that if Jesus saw the Holy Spirit ὡς περιστεράν, He was not led to it by any symbolism current in the piety of His own people. Hugo Gressmann suggested that it might, nevertheless, have been current in less orthodoxly Jewish connexions in Galilee.[1] He marshalled plentiful evidence for the widespread belief, in Syrian lands, that the dove is an ἐπιφάνεια of the heaven-goddess. It is probable enough that in the life of Nazareth there was much that derived from the pagan culture of Syria. But the Jews shewed remarkable power of maintaining their individuality, especially with regard to religious ideas. And the transition from the doves of Atargatis to the baptismal vision of Jesus involves a vast change of moral-religious atmosphere. On the other hand, it would be unwise to deny any nexus whatever. The association of the dove with the heaven-goddess is bound up with the long-established practice of dove-keeping. Belief and custom interact, and it is likely enough that the flocks of tame doves that made the towns of Palestine their home enjoyed a peculiar regard ultimately due to the sacred character attributed to them. This, however, is speculation. The ideas that find actual expression need no more explanation than is afforded by the tameness and other observed qualities of the dove. We are thus left free to consider the individual musing of Jesus as matrix of 'the form of a dove'. We know that He mused on things about Him; on the sparrows, which filled Him with wonder at the divine Fatherhood that could give value to things so disvalued of men; and again on the doves, as is proved by His saying in Matt. x 16 'Be ye ἀκέραιοι as doves'. Hosea had used the adjective ἄνους,[2] but Jesus substitutes a higher moral suggestion.[3] He gave His disciples the dove for emblem when He sent them out on their first mission. It is an apt one, because of the pacific and guileless character of their campaign.

---

[1] Samuel Bochart *Hierozoicon* ii 568–71. Ed. 1794.

[2] Strack and Billerbeck *l. c.*, p. 125, end of note on Matt. iii 16.

[3] *Quis Rer. Div. Heres?* c. 49 (Cohn and Wendland, vol. iii p. 30) *φιλέρημος μὲν γὰρ ἡ θεία σοφία, διὰ τὸν μόνον θέον, οὗ κτῆμά ἐστι, τὴν μόνωσιν ἀγαπῶσα συμβολικῶς αὕτη τρυγὼν καλεῖται.* It contrasts with another, human, wisdom—*ἥμερος καὶ τιθασὸς καὶ ἀγελαῖος, τὰ ἀνθρώπων ἄστη περιπολοῦσα καὶ διαίτῃ τῇ μετὰ θνητῶν ἀσμενίζουσα· περιστερᾷ ταύτην ἀπεικάζουσιν.*

It would be more natural than not that the thoughts of Jesus at the moment of commissioning His disciples should reflect those with which He began His own ministry. He, too, had received His commission. He had waited, like Elijah, for the voice of God, and it came to Him by Jordan.

The character of the mission might naturally be reflected in the circumstances of the call. A marked feature of these is the homeliness of the form, which would be grotesque were it not dignified by moral significance. It is dignified, because the dove is a fitting emblem (not of God the Holy Ghost, nor of an outpouring of heavenly power, but) of the unique moral character of the ministry of Jesus. The form of a dove accords with the text from which Luke represents Him as beginning His preaching, *πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέ με* ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΣΑΣΘΑΙ ΠΤΩΧΟΙΣ.[1] It is consonant with His solution of the problems of the Temptation, and harmonizes with His teaching in the Beatitudes. In short, it fits intimately with what we know of the start of His ministry, and His mind as therein revealed. And the symbolizing by the dove of the Holy Spirit as a Person must be regarded as a product of subsequent Christian thought.[2]

---

[1] *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* vol. xx p. 323 ff. *Die Sage von der Taufe Jesu und die vorderorientalische Taubengöttin.* Note the remark on p. 329, 'Dem orthodoxen Judentum des Zeit Christi die Taube als *Totenvogel* gelt'.

[2] vii 11, LXX.

[3] The attribution of good moral qualities to the dove is to be found independently of the characterization by Jesus, and earlier in date; but not anything quite like His ἀκέραιος. See Bochart *l. c.*

W. TELFER.

ΠΕΡΙΧΩΡΕΩ AND *ΠΕΡΙΧΩΡΗΣΙΣ* IN THE FATHERS

περιχωρέω

[Extremely rare until John of Damascus]

1. *go round, encompass,* Mac. Aeg. *de pat. et discr.* 5 (M. 34. 869 A) *κύκλῳ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας τὸ κάλυμμα τοῦ σκότους* περιχωρεῖ.

2. of extremes (on opposites sides of a rotating mechanism) (cf. our metaphor of the 'opposite sides of the same shield'), *come round* to, *reciprocate* or *interchange with, pass* or *resolve themselves* into, one another, Gr. Naz. *or.* 18. 42 *ζωὴ γοῦν καὶ θάνατος, ταῦθ' ἅπερ λέγεται, πλεῖστον ἀλλήλων διαφέρειν δοκοῦντα, εἰς ἄλληλα* περιχωρεῖ *πως καὶ ἀντικαθίσταται· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ φθορᾶς ἀρχομένη τῆς μητρὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ διὰ φθορᾶς ὁδεύουσα τῆς ἀεὶ τοῦ πάροντος ἐκστάσεως, εἰς φθορὰν καταστρέφει τὴν τοῦ βίου τούτου κατάλυσιν· ὁ δὲ τῶν ἐνταῦθα κακῶν ἀπαλλαγὴν ἔχων καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἄνω πολλάκις μετάγων ζωὴν κτλ, ib.* 22. 4 *ὥστε . . . κόρος ἐστὶ . . . καὶ πλησμονὴ πάντων, οὐ τῶν ἀλγεινῶν μόνον ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ τῶν ἡδίστων, καὶ*

---

[1] Lk. iv 18; citing Isa. lxi 1–2.

[2] For dove-symbolism in general see Martigny *op. cit.* s. v. *Colombe*, also *Esprit Saint*, et *Apôtres*. H. Leclercq *Manuel d'archéol. chrét.* especially under *Verres* c. 10 and *Terre cuite* c. 11. Smith and Cheetham *Dict. of Christian Antiquities* s. v. Dove, &c. Cabrol *Dict. archéol. chrét.* s. v. *Colombe*. Mr. A. D. Nock draws my attention to important new points in F. J. Dölger, *Das Fisch-Symbol*, just published. See p. 55; and p. 270, where Dölger shews against Pfättisch that the *αἰγλήεσσα περιστερά* which the *Oratio Constantini*, c xi, describes as descending to the Virgin's bosom, is not the Holy Spirit, but the Logos Himself. The inference is that the 'Third Person' significance of the form of a dove was still unknown in the middle fourth century.

πάντα εἰς ἄλληλα περιχωρεῖ τε καὶ περιτρέπεται, *ep.* 101 (2. 87 C) εἴ τις λέγοι τὴν σάρκα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατεληλυθέναι . . . ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. τὸ γάρ, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ [1 Cor. xv 47] . . . νομιστέον λέγεσθαι διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν οὐράνιον ἕνωσιν, . . . κιρναμένων, ὥσπερ τῶν φυσέων, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τῶν κλησέων, καὶ περιχωρουσῶν εἰς ἀλλήλας τῷ λόγῳ τῆς συμφυΐας. It will be observed that Gregory does not expressly apply the term περιχωρέω to the natures of Christ, but to the descriptive titles which he derived from those natures: a reference to Christ as 'Man' comes to the same effect as a reference to him as 'God': the 'Second Man' came from heaven, though in fact his manhood did not come from heaven at all.

3. Maximus Confessor found the word in Gregory, for whose writings he cherished a most profound regard, and adopted it, together with the cognate noun περιχώρησις, of which no single instance seems to occur before Maximus.

Max. Conf. *schol. in* [Dion. Ar.] *ep.* 4. 8 (Cord. 2. 77 D) οὐ κατὰ θεὸν τὰ θεῖα ἔδρασεν, ἦν γὰρ ἄνθρωπος, οὔτε κατὰ ἄνθρωπον τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, ἦν γὰρ καὶ θεός· ὅθεν θαυμαστῶς ὁ θεῖος Γρηγόριος ὁ θεολόγος φησί, κιρναμένων ὥσπερ τῶν φύσεων οὕτω δὴ καὶ τῶν κλησέων, καὶ περιχωρουσῶν εἰς ἀλλήλας, *ambig.* 112 b D (M. 91. 1053 B) ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον ἐνήργει τὰ ἀνθρώπου, . . . συμφυεῖσαν δεικνὺς τῇ θεϊκῇ δυνάμει τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνέργειαν· ἐπειδὴ ἡ φύσις ἀσυγχύτως ἑνωθεῖσα τῇ φύσει δι᾽ ὅλου περικεχώρηκε, μηδὲν ἀπόλυτον παντάπασιν ἔχουσα καὶ τῆς ἡνωμένης αὐτῇ καθ᾽ ὑπόστασιν κεχωρισμένον θεότητος [*is revolutionized*, or *is become reciprocal to it*].

Maximus apparently means by the passage above that the human nature is *involved with* the divine nature and *reciprocates* with it, since from the moment of union it ceases to have any detached activities, and cannot function without reference to the divine nature with which it is united by the pivot of a common ὑπόστασις. The metaphor is still that employed by Gregory: the two opposites are revealed as complementary sides of a single concrete object by the rotation of that object: the two natures reciprocate not merely in name, as with Gregory, but in practical effect and operation. It no more matters by which nature Christ seems to operate than it does by which title he is called; since he is both divine and human, both natures are involved in his incarnate actions, and the human side rotating through a complete half-circuit reveals the divine side. See further under περιχώρησις.

4. John of Damascus in his turn found the terms περιχωρέω and περιχώρησις in Maximus, from whose writings he quotes the latter (Max. *c. Pyrrh.* 191 D = Joh. *fid. orth.* 3. 19, 243 A). But he entirely missed their sense, being misled by the uncompounded verb χωρέω

(= hold, contain) into thinking that they indicated a sort of penetration or permeation. Applied to the two natures this idea made of the περιχώρησις the actual process of their union, whereas in Gregory and Maximus it had been the result of their union. Consequently in John's Christology it is difficult to avoid practical Monophysitism unless the περιχώρησις or co-inherence of the humanity and the deity is reduced to a purely formal relationship. In other words a term so meaningless, or alternatively so misleading, as this is in the sense which John of Damascus attached to it, had far better have been avoided altogether.

But John compensated for his Christological indiscretion by an advance of real theological value. From the time of Saint John the Evangelist there had not been found any convenient general term to describe the mutual relations of the three Persons of the Godhead to each other. Origen had safeguarded the timelessness of their active relations by his phrase 'eternal generation', and Gregory of Nyssa had done more perhaps than any other to illustrate their mutual involution, but no one phrase existed which was capable of finally disposing both of Sabellianism and of tritheism by casting a ray of explanatory definition over their simultaneity of mere being, and shewing in a single illuminating term how they were really three, eternally and not just successively, without being three of a species and consequently three Gods. So long as *μία οὐσία* continued to mean 'one object, regarded as real', which it did down to the fifth century, the unity of God was secured, though the manner of that unity was left untheorized and technically unexplained. But by the time of Leontius *μία οὐσία* had lost this sense and come to mean 'one species'. It is, therefore, not surprising that tritheism in some form is alleged to have come into vogue again towards the end of the sixth century.

What John of Damascus did was to remedy the defect by extending to 'theology' the term he had derived from the Christology of Maximus. He extended it not in the semi-technical sense of 'interchange' or 'reciprocity' which was its proper meaning, but in the new and fully technical sense of 'interpenetration' in which he himself understood it, a sense really unsuited to Christology but admirably expressive of Trinitarian unity. So much more suitable is it for this purpose that Bishop Bull observed (*Def. Nic. Creed* iv 4. 14), 'When some of the ancients also attribute circuminsession to the two natures in Christ, which they say interpenetrate each other, we must understand them to use the expression in a less proper sense'. For, as he pointed out, the three Persons are commensurate but the two natures are not.

The following passages may be quoted:

(*a*) on Christology. Joh. Dam. *c. Jacob.* 52 (409 A) *ἐν αὐτῇ* [sc. *τῇ μιᾷ ὑποστάσει*] *διὰ τῆς σαρκώσεως ἑνοῦνται αἱ δύο φύσεις τῆς τε θεότητος* *καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, καὶ περιχωροῦσιν ἐν* [N.B. not *εἰς*] *ἀλλήλαις, ἡ δὲ περιχώρησις ἐκ τῆς θεότητος γίνεται,* *fid. orth.* 3. 8 (217 B) *ἡνωμέναι γὰρ καθ' ὑπόστασιν καὶ ἐν ἀλλήλαις περιχωροῦσαι ἀσυγχύτως ἥνωνται,* *ib.* 3. 5 (211 A) *καὶ εἰ ἐν ἀλλήλαις περιχωροῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν εἰς ἀλλήλας τροπήν τε καὶ μεταβολὴν οὐ προσίενται,* *ib.* 4. 18 (286 B) *ἡ δὲ περιχώρησις οὐκ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς θεότητος γέγονεν· ἀμήχανον γὰρ τὴν σάρκα περιχωρῆσαι διὰ τῆς θεότητος· ἀλλ' ἡ θεία φύσις ἅπαξ περιχωροῦσα διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ἔδωκε καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ τὴν πρὸς ταύτην ἄρρητον περιχώρησιν ἣν δὴ ἕνωσιν λέγομεν,* *ib.* 3. 7 (215 D) *ἰστέον δὲ ὡς εἰ καὶ περιχωρεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλαις τὰς τοῦ κυρίου φύσεις φαμὲν, ἀλλ' οἴδαμεν ὡς ἐκ τῆς θείας φύσεως ἡ περιχώρησις γέγονεν. αὕτη μὲν γὰρ διὰ πάντων διήκει καθὼς βούλεται καὶ περιχωρεῖ, δι' αὐτῆς δὲ οὐδέν.*

From these passages it is abundantly clear that the term implies interpenetration; that this process is identical with, not the result of, the union; that the process is purely one-sided; that it is similar in kind, if not in degree, to the immanence of God in all things; that although an effect of it is to heighten the powers of the human nature, yet the two natures are to be regarded as remaining distinct; and that consequently the term is merely an unnecessary technicality which adds no fresh idea to Christological thought, but is extremely liable to be misleading.

(*b*) on the Trinity. Joh. Dam. *fid. orth.* 3. 5 (210 C) *ἐν ἀλλήλαις ἀσυγχύτως περιχωρούσας ἐπιστάμεθα* [SC. *τὰς ὑποστάσεις*].

That even with reference to the Trinity the term was not altogether free from misconception is shown by Niceph. Const. *ad. Leon. III* (M. 100. 184 D) *ἀδιαίρετος γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ τριὰς . . . οὔτε τῶν θεαρχικῶν ὑποστάσεων μεταπιπτουσῶν καὶ περιχωρουσῶν εἰς ἀλλήλας . . . πόρρω γὰρ ἀποπεμπέσθω . . . ἡ . . . Σαββελλίου ἀπατητικὴ σύγχυσις* [but N.B. the phrase attacked is *περιχωρειν εἰς*, not *περιχωρεῖν ἐν*].

περιχώρησις

1. Maximus uses this word in a sense of which no literal translation is possible: it amounts to *revelation* or *epiphany*, exhibited in response to faith through turning half-circle from appearance to reality. Max. Conf. *cap. D* 4. 19 (588 A) *σωτηρία . . . ἐστὶ, τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως· τέλος δὲ πίστεώς ἐστιν, ἡ τοῦ πιστευθέντος ἀληθὴς ἀποκάλυψις· ἀληθὴς δὲ τοῦ πιστευθέντος ἐστὶν ἀποκάλυψις, ἡ κατὰ ἀναλογίαν τῆς ἐν ἑκάστῳ πίστεως ἄρρητος τοῦ πεπιστευμένου περιχώρησις· περιχώρησις δὲ τοῦ πεπιστευμένου καθέστηκεν, ἡ πρὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν κατὰ τὸ τέλος τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἐπάνοδος· ἡ δὲ πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν ἀρχὴν κατὰ τὸ τέλος τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἐπάνοδός ἐστιν, ἡ τῆς ἐφέσεως πλήρωσις, κτλ.*

[Salvation . . . is the end of faith: the end of faith is the actual disclosure of what has been believed: actual disclosure of what has been believed is the ineffable revelation of the object of faith (i. e. of him in whom faith has been put) proportionately to the faith that is in each believer: in revelation of the object of faith consists the final recurrence of those who have believed to their origin: and the final recurrence of those who have believed to their proper origin is the fulfilment of desire.]

In the above translation περιχώρησις has been rendered *revelation*, but *revolution* would have been nearer to the literal sense. The word is to be taken intransitively, as in all the instances of the cognate verb down to and including Maximus: πεπιστευμένου is a subjective genitive. It implies that the object of faith, from having been discerned dimly from the back, has now turned round and revealed his glory: cf. Exodus xxxiii 18–23 'Shew me, I pray thee, thy glory. . . . Thou shalt see my back, but my face shall not be seen'. In the Beatific Vision man shall see, proportionately to his faith, what Moses was denied because 'man shall not see me and live'.

It is tempting to take the word in an active sense and translate it 'compass', with πεπιστευμένου an objective genitive. This sense would fit in very well with the context, and would imply that man penetrates, attains to, is absorbed into the deity. It would then also be attached to the verb as used in the passage quoted from the *ambigua*, and is akin to the sense in which both words are in fact employed regularly by John of Damascus.

But there are objections. It is hard to suppose that Maximus failed to understand the sense of the verb in his revered Gregory. Nor is it desirable to infer that a word has completely changed its sense until proof is forthcoming: this proof exists for John, but not, apparently, for Maximus: and in this case it is more prudent to keep to the old translation where the word occurs in Maximus. And there are more solid arguments for this conservative treatment of the problem. Maximus in the *ambigua* passage already referred to makes the humanity of Christ περιχωρεῖν upon its union with the divine nature: and in the passage under discussion, if the sense of 'interpenetration' is to be accepted, it will be the man who interpenetrates the divine. This is in itself an unlikely way of putting the matter, and is expressly opposite to John's statement that the divine nature can penetrate human nature, but not vice versa. Moreover, the fact that the preposition εἰς is retained by Maximus from Gregory in connexion with the περιχώρησις of the two natures of Christ suggests that the sense of joint and simultaneous revolution to the opposite points in a given circuit is more appropriate than that of an interpenetration by one object of another. It is true that John takes over the expression περιχώρησις εἰς ἀλλήλας from Maximus: but it is significant that more often than not he changes the preposition from εἰς to ἐν.

Fortunately a passage survives which greatly strengthens the position for the sense of *revolution*, Max. Conf. *schol. in* [Dion. Ar.] *div. nom.* v 8. 7 (Cord. 713 E) τὰ ἐν γενέσει καὶ φθορᾷ πάντα, καὶ ὅσα κατὰ ἀντιπεριχώρησιν, οἷον ἡ νύξ, ἡ ἡμέρα, θέρος καὶ ἔαρ, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. Night and day do not interpenetrate, even by contrast (ἀντι-), but they do alternate, and may properly be said each to take up the running at the point where the other ends its course, and to be at any given moment on opposite sides of their joint circuit. All of which is most aptly expressed by the term ἀντιπεριχώρησις.

Moreover the term ἀντιπεριχωρέω actually occurs with reference to the two natures of Christ. Leont. Byz. *Nest. & Eut.* 2 (M 86. 1320 B) τί δ' ἂν εἴποις περὶ τῶν . . . ἐνέργειάν τε πρὸς τούτοις ἄλλην μὲν σαρκὸς ἑτέραν δὲ θεότητος, πάθος τε περὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἀπάθειαν περὶ τὸν λόγον, ὁμολογούντων· [ἀντιπεριχωρεῖν ταύτας δεδώκασι καὶ ἀντικατηγορεῖσθαι θατέρου διὰ τὴν ἐν θατέρῳ ταὐτοῦ ἐπαλλάττουσαν ἰδιότητα·] τὰ δὲ νῦν . . . τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ προσθεμένων; About this it must be pointed out first that the clause containing the word under discussion forms a parenthesis interpolated very awkwardly into the main sentence, and may be a gloss upon the original passage of Leontius. If so it is not likely to be of later date than the time of Maximus, since the sense of ἀντιπεριχωρέω is clearly not that in which περιχωρέω is used by John of Damascus. The meaning is shewn by the context to be *alternate* or *reciprocate*. Terms indicative of either nature and energy may be predicated alternatively of the individuality (ἰδιότης) which belongs to the one single object or person expressed alternatively in either nature. Christ is one individual being in whichever nature he is conceived to be acting at a given moment or from a given point of view: and consequently there is said to be reciprocation between the two natures. This instance, isolated though it is, of ἀντιπεριχωρέω affords very strong evidence that the natural and proper Christological sense of περιχώρησις is *reciprocation*.

It will not therefore be unsafe to assume that in all his uses of the two cognate terms, περιχωρέω and περιχώρησις, Maximus has the same idea in mind. The sense of *interpenetration* is to be rejected for this author.

The following passages illustrate Maximus's Christological use of περιχώρησις:

disp. Pyrrh. 187 A (M. 91. 337 C) καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ προφορὰν δὲ λόγου ὡσαύτως, καὶ τὴν ἐγκειμένην τῷ λόγῳ ὁρῶμεν ἔννοιαν καὶ τὸν ὑποκείμενον τῇ ἐννοίᾳ λόγον καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν δι' ὅλου εἰς ἄλληλα περιχώρησιν· καὶ οὔτε τῇ διαφορᾷ αὐτῶν τὸ διάφορον τῶν προσώπων συνεισάγεται, οὔτε τῇ ἄκρᾳ ἑνώσει τὸσυγκεχυμένον [he continues by comparing the familiar red-hot dagger, in which are found the φυσικαὶ ἐνέργειαι of τομὴ and of καῦσις though there is only one dagger].

ib. 191 D (M. 345 D = Joh. Dam. *fid. orth.* 3. 19, 243 A). τὸν . . . τρόπον τῆς τῶν φυσικῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνεργειῶν ἐκφάνσεως, τῷ ἀπορρήτῳ τρόπῳ τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλας τῶν Χριστοῦ φύσεων περιχωρήσεως προσφόρως, καὶ τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ πολιτείαν, . . . καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀπόρρητον ἕνωσιν ἀντιδόσεως,

opusc. 102 B (M. 91. 189 D) . . . καιτοι μετὰ πυρὸς ὑπάρχων [sc. ὁ σίδηρος] κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν, καὶ ἀδιαστάτως δρῶν τά τε κατὰ φύσιν ἰδίαν, λέγω δὲ τὴν τομὴν, καὶ τὰ καθ' ἕνωσιν αὖθις, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ καῦσις· αὐτοῦ γὰρ ὑπάρχει, καθάπερ καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ἡ τομὴ, διὰ τὴν ἄκραν τούτων εἰς ἄλληλα περιχώρησίν τε καὶ ἀντίδοσιν,

ib. 44 C (M. 88 A) παρέστησε ταύτας ἡνωμένας διόλου τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλας συμφυΐᾳ καὶ περιχωρήσει [sc. τὰς φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας],

ib. 125 B (M. 232 A) μίαν εἶπεν ἐνέργειαν [sc. Anast. Sinait.], διὰ τὸ μηδὲν θεῖον ἢ ἀνθρώπινον κεχωρισμένως ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ συμφυῶς ἅμα καὶ ἡνωμένως προάγεσθαι, κατὰ τὴν ἐν τούτοις ἑνιαίαν περιχώρησιν.

It appears from these quotations that Maximus had in mind a *reciprocation* of joint activity when he talked about the περιχώρησις of our Lord's two natures or of their 'natural energies', not in the least a static condition of mutual fusion or permeation. He did not use the term in order to safeguard or explain the unity of Christ, but in order to explain the singleness of result and effect which proceeded from the two natures that were united in his Person. The 'natural energies' συμφύουσι καὶ περιχωροῦσι πρὸς ἀλλήλας, in relation to one another, but not ἐν ἀλλήλαις.

2. In John of Damascus the term means 'co-inherence'.

(*a*) Trinitarian usage.

Joh. Dam. *rect. sent.* 1 (391 C) οὔτε γὰρ χρόνῳ τέμνεται [sc. τὰ τρία], οὐ τόπῳ [sic], οὐ δυνάμει μερίζεται, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀλλήλοις τήν περιχώρησιν ἔχουσι δίχα πάσης συναλοιφῆς καὶ συγχύσεως,

c. Jacob. 78 (415 A) οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐσίᾳ τέμνονται, οὐ δυνάμει χωρίζονται, οὐ τόπῳ, οὐκ ἐνεργείᾳ, οὐ βουλήσει μερίζονται, ἀνεκφοίτητον ἔχοντες τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἵδρυσίν τε καὶ περιχώρησιν,

fid. orth. 1. 8 (140 A) ἑνοῦνται γὰρ, ὡς ἔφημεν, οὐχ ὥστε συγχεῖσθαι ἀλλ' ὥστε ἔχεσθαι ἀλλήλων· καὶ τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλαις περιχώρησιν ἔχουσι δίχα πάσης συναλοιφῆς καὶ συμφύρσεως,

ib. 1. 14 (152 C) ἡ ἐν ἀλλήλαις τῶν ὑποστάσεων μονή τε καὶ ἵδρυσις· ἀδιάστατοι γὰρ αὗται καὶ ἀνεκφοίτητοι ἀλλήλων εἰσίν, ἀσύγχυτον ἔχουσαι τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλαις περιχώρησιν, cf. *ib.* 4. 18 (284 E) τὰ δὲ [sc. δηλοῖ] τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλαις τῶν ὑποστάσεων περιχώρησιν, ὡς τό, ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί [John xiv 10],

nat. comp. 4 (524 B, C) αἱ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις . . . ἥνωνται, ἀδιαιρέτως μὲν διὰ τὸ μοναδικὸν τῆς φύσεως καὶ τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλαις ἀσύγχυτον περιχώρησιν, ἀσυγχύτως δὲ διὰ τὴν ὑποστατικὴν διαφορὰν ἤτοι τὸν τῆς ὑπάρξεως τρόπον, τὸ ἀγέννητόν φημι κτλ. . . . οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σαρκώσεως, αἱ δύο φύσεις . . . ἥνωνται, ἀδιαιρέτως μὲν διά τε τὸ μοναδικὸν τῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλαις τῶν φύσεων ἀσύγχυτον περιχώρησιν, ἀσυγχύτως δὲ διὰ τὴν οὐσιώδη διαφοράν.

From these passages it follows that:

περιχώρησις is not a consequence but an equivalent of unity.

It has drawn to itself the adjectives denying confusion, which in earlier writers were associated with ἕνωσις.

It represents an attempt to define the nature of the unity, and is associated with ἵδρυσις and μονή.

It is illustrated negatively by being treated as incompatible with separation in substance, in place, or time, in power, operation, or will.

The last passage quoted is of special interest for two reasons: it puts the co-inherence of the three Persons on a level with their unity of nature as a ground of the divine unity, in a manner which constitutes a distinct advance in formal definition: and it illustrates the formal tendency to equate the definition of the Trinity with that of the Incarnation which is a feature of later Greek theology, and was only effected by altering the sense of οὐσία, and could only be maintained by John through straining the meaning attached by himself to περιχώρησις.

(*b*) Christological usage.

(i) περιχώρησις on a level with ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν.

Joh. Dam. *fid. orth.* 3. 8 (216 B) ἡνωμέναι γὰρ καθ' ὑπόστασιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλαις περιχώρησιν ἔχουσαι, ἀσυγχύτως ἥνωνται,

ib. 3. 17 (239 A) οὐ κατὰ μεταβολὴν φύσεως ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομικὴν ἕνωσιν, τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν λέγω, καθ' ἣν ἀδιασπάστως τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ ἥνωται, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλαις τῶν φύσεων περιχώρησιν [sc. the flesh was 'deified'],

ib. 4. 18 (286 B) τῶν δύο φύσεων καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνωθεισῶν καὶ τὴν εἰς ἀλλήλας περιχώρησιν ἀσύγχυτον . . . ἐχουσῶν,

ib. A τῆς . . . ἁρμογῆς καὶ περιχωρήσεως,

de imag. 1. 21 (317 C) ἀσυγχύτως ἐκράθη πρὸς τὸ ἡμέτερον καὶ ἀμεταβλήτως τὴν σάρκα ἐθέωσε, διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλαις τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς ἀσυγχύτου περιχωρήσεως [sic],

c. Jacob. 81 (417 A) ἕτερον μέντοι καὶ ἕτερον λόγῳ καὶ τρόπῳ τῆς διαφορᾶς, κοινὰ δὲ ἑκατέρῳ ἑκάτερα τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως διὰ τὴν εἰς ἄλληλα τῶν μερῶν περιχώρησιν καὶ τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἕνωσιν.

(ii) περιχώρησις strictly speaking one-sided.

fid. orth 4. 18 (286 B) ἡ δὲ περιχώρησις οὐκ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς θεότητος γέγονεν· ἀμήχανον γὰρ τὴν σάρκα περιχωρῆσαι διὰ τῆς θεότητος· ἀλλ' ἡ θεία φύσις ἅπαξ περιχωροῦσα διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ἔδωκε καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ τὴν πρὸς ταύτην ἄρρητον περιχώρησιν ἣν δὴ ἕνωσιν λέγομεν,

ib. 3. 17 (239 A) [SC. ἡ σὰρξ θεοῦται] οὐ κατὰ μεταβολὴν φύσεως ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν . . . ἕνωσιν . . . καὶ τὴν ἐνάλλήλαις τῶν φύσεων περιχώρησιν, ὥς φαμεν καὶ τὴν τοῦ σιδήρου πύρωσιν . . . [*ib.* C] μεμενήκασι . . . αἵ τε φύσεις ἀσύμφυρτοι καὶ αἱ τούτων ἰδιότητες ἀλώβητοι· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κυρίου σὰρξ τὰς θείας ἐνεργείας ἐπλούτησε διὰ τὴν . . . ἕνωσιν, . . . οὐ γὰρ κατ' οἰκείαν ἐνεργείαν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἡνωμένον αὐτῇ λόγον τὰ θεῖα ἐνήργει, τοῦ λόγου δι' αὐτῆς τὴν οἰκείαν ἐνδεικνυμένου ἐνέργειαν.

A very fine distinction is here drawn. The characteristics of the humanity are unimpaired, and its natural properties are unaltered. Nevertheless divine operations, though they do not proceed from it, do proceed through it, owing to the union and the co-inherence. The metaphor of the red-hot sword is excellent so far as it goes, and illustrates the mechanical problem admirably. But it fails to help to a solution of the psychological problem. If divine energies are to be allowed as proceeding, from the heavenly sphere of the consciousness of the Logos, through the humanity, there will be grave danger of Apollinarianism: that is, it will not be easy to reconcile such 'control' with the survival of Christ's human consciousness, particularly in the sphere of volition. It is not impossible to make a reconciliation between Christ's genuinely human consciousness and a heightening of or increase in his strictly human powers through the association of the two natures. But this is not the place to undertake it. John of Damascus does not seem to betray any sign that he was aware of a psychological problem at all.

Further passages support the one-sidedness of the co-inherence of the natures, and the latent tendency to ascribe to it, in substance if not formally, a real transference of divine powers to the human nature of Christ, e. g.

fid. orth. 3. 7 (215 D) ἐκ τῆς θείας φύσεως ἡ περιχώρησις γέγονεν· αὕτη μὲν γὰρ διὰ πάντων διήκει κάθως βούλεται καὶ περιχωρεῖ, δι' αὐτῆς δὲ οὐδέν· καὶ αὕτη μὲν τῶν οἰκείων αὐχημάτων τῇ σαρκὶ μεταδίδωσι, μένουσα αὐτὴ ἀπαθὴς καὶ τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς παθῶν ἀμέτοχος. εἰ γὰρ ἥλιος ἡμῖν τῶν οἰκείων ἐνεργειῶν μεταδιδοὺς μένει τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀμέτοχος, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ τοῦ ἡλίου ποιητής τε καὶ κύριος,

c. Jacob. 52 (409 A) ἡ δὲ περιχώρησις ἐκ τῆς θεότητος γίνεται. αὕτη γὰρ μεταδίδωσι τῇ σαρκὶ τῆς οἰκείας δόξης τε καὶ λαμπρότητος, οὐ μεταλαμβάνουσα τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς παθῶν. διὸ ἡ μὲν φύσις τῆς σαρκὸς θεοῦται, οὐ σαρκοῖ δὲ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ λόγου· θεοῖ μὲν τὸ πρόσλημμα, οὐ σαρκοῦται δέ . . . ὡς γὰρ ὁ σίδηρος μὲν πυροῦται, τὸ δὲ πῦρ οὐ σιδηροῦται· καὶ ὡς ἡ σὰρξ μὲν ψυχοῦται, ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ οὐ σαρκοῦται· οὕτως ἡ θεία φύσις κτλ.

cf. *exp. fid.* 9 (667 c) [from the Arabic] corpus ejus deificatum fuit accipiendo penetrationem [περιχώρησιν] deitatis in seipso, cujus operatione impletum fuit. quia verbum affecit illud proprietatibus deitatis, ita ut divinis veluti vulneribus perforatus sit,

cf. [Cyr.] (? Joh. Dam.) *s. Trin.* 22 (28 A) *τὸ χρίσαν μὲν ἡ θεότης, ἡ ἀνθρωπότης δὲ τὸ χρισθέν· χρίσιν δὲ νοητέον τὴν ὅλου τοῦ χρίσματος εἰς ὅλον τὸ χρισθὲν* περιχώρησιν *. . . τὸ γὰρ ἐπιπολαίως χρισθὲν, ἐκ μέρους χριστόν . . . μόνος τοίνυν ὁ κύριος κυρίως χριστὸς, ὡς ὅλος διόλου καὶ οὐ χάριτι, τῇ δὲ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνώσει . . . χριστός.*

(iii) Consequences of περιχώρησις merely formal in the last resort.

In spite of the tendency just described, John safeguards himself very carefully from Monophysitism. One result of the co-inherence of the two natures is an interchange or *ἀντίδοσις*. But this is purely a matter of formality or nomenclature: no properties of either nature are actually transferred through it to the other, but the title derived from either nature may be applied to the Person in whom both natures are united. The two natures in themselves are, therefore, kept in strict distinction from one another. Consequently there is no justification for supposing that the added or heightened powers referred to in the last paragraph were regarded by John as really bestowed upon the human nature. Rather they were manifested through it, quite literally, as described above. Illustrations of the formalism of the *ἀντίδοσις* are to be found in:

fid. orth. 3. 3 (208 B) *μεταδίδωσι τῇ σαρκὶ* [sc. ὁ λόγος] *τῶν ἰδίων, κατὰ τὸν ἀντιδόσεως τρόπον, διὰ τὴν εἰς ἄλληλα τῶν μερῶν* περιχώρησιν *καὶ τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἕνωσιν . . . διὸ δὴ καὶ ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης ἐσταυρῶσθαι λέγεται* [1 Cor. ii 8] . . . *καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πρὸ τοῦ πάθους ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἶναι ὡμολόγηται* [John iii 13],

ib. 3. 4 (210 B) *ἑκατέρας φύσεως ἀντιδιδούσης τῇ ἑτέρᾳ τὰ ἴδια διὰ τὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως ταυτότητα καὶ τὴν εἰς ἄλληλα αὐτῶν* περιχώρησιν. *κατὰ τοῦτο δυνάμεθα εἰπεῖν περὶ Χριστοῦ, Οὗτος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη* [Baruch iii 35, 37], . . . *καὶ, Ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ἄκτιστός ἐστι καὶ ἀπαθής,*

c. Jacob. 81 (417 A) *ἕτερον μέντοι καὶ ἕτερον λόγῳ καὶ τρόπῳ τῆς διαφορᾶς, κοινὰ δὲ ἑκατέρῳ ἑκάτερα τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως, διὰ τὴν εἰς ἄλληλα τῶν μερῶν* περιχώρησιν *καὶ τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἕνωσιν· ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ ἑκατέρα μορφὴ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας τοὖθ' ὅπερ ἴδιον ἔσχηκε· διὸ δὴ καὶ ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης ἐσταυρῶσθαι λέγεται . . . καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀνεληλυθέναι ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον γέγραπται* [John vi 62],

in transfig. 2 (2. 792 C) *καὶ θεοῦ μὲν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα γίνεται, ἀνθρώπου δὲ τὰ θεῖα, τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως καὶ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἀσυγχύτου* περιχωρήσεως *καὶ τῆς καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἄκρας ἑνώσεως· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ κἀκεῖνο ὢν* *ἀϊδίως, κἂν τοῦτο γενόμενος ὕστερον* [N.B. not *θείου τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, ἀνθρωπίνου δὲ τὰ θεῖα*].

Postscript. Stephanus gives the references to two cases of *ἀντιπεριχώρησις*, which shew that the word survived in its original sense as late as the end of the thirteenth century. In these instances it quite obviously means *interchangeability*.

The passages in question are Joh. Vecc. *depos. sua* 2. 15 (M. 141. 989 D) *εἰ γὰρ ἡ Ἐξ ἀντὶ τῆς Διά* [sc. with reference to the procession of the Holy Spirit in the *filioque* controversy, in which Veccus was a champion of the Latinizers], *τὸ κωλύον πάντως οὐδὲν καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς Ἐξ ἐκλαμβάνεσθαι τὴν Διά· τὴν γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων προθέσεων ἀντιπεριχώρησιν καὶ ὁ μέγας ἡμῖν συστήσει Βασίλειος, ἐν οἷς ταύτας πρὸς τὰ ὑπ᾽ ἀλλήλων σημαινόμενα πολλάκις ἀντιμεθίστασθαι σαφῶς ἐκδιδάσκει*, cf. *ib.* 992 A *τὴν ῥηθεῖσαν ἀντιμετάστασιν πρὸς τὰ ὑπ᾽ ἀλλήλων σημαινόμενα τῶν προθέσεων τούτων*, Geo. Pach. *Andr. Pal.* 2. 1, 73 C (M. 144. 122 B) *εἰ γὰρ ἅπαξ τὸ Ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀπηγόρευται, ἀποκέκλεισται πάντως καὶ ἡ διὰ τῆς ἀντιπεριχωρήσεως τῶν προθέσεων θεραπεία τοῖς Ἰταλοῖς*, *ib.* 73 E, 74 B (M. 123 A, B). Veccus was deposed for his Latinizing from the patriarchate of Constantinople in 1282.

LEONARD PRESTIGE.

THE MASORETIC READING OF ISAIAH xliii 14

THUS saith the LORD your redeemer the Holy One of Israel: :למענכם שלחתי בבלה והורדתי בריחים כלם וכשדים באניות רנתם (M. T.).

ἕνεκεν ὑμῶν ἀποστελῶ εἰς Βαβυλῶνα καὶ ἐπεγερῶ φεύγοντας πάντας καὶ Χαλδαῖοι ἐν πλοίοις (LXX. B, *κλοιοῖς* LXX. A) *δεθήσονται.*

בדיל חוביכון איתגליתון לבבל ואחיתית במשוטין כולכון וכסדאי בספיני תושבחתהון i. e. Because of your sins ye were led captive to Babylon, and I brought down all of you in boats, yea, the Chaldeans (brought you) in the ships of their glory. (Targum, ed. Lagarde.)

For your sake have I sent to Babylon, and have brought (*lege* brought down) all the fugitives, and the Chaldeans who glory in ships, ܕܒܣܦܝ̈ܢܐ ܡܫܬܒܗܪܝܢ. (Peshiṭta).

For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and I will bring down all of them as fugitives, even the Chaldeans, in the ships of their rejoicing. (Revised Version.)

The text of this passage has been treated as corrupt by a succession of scholars. It is sufficient to mention the names of Ewald (*Propheten*, 1868), Cheyne (*Introduction to Isaiah*, 1895), Box (Isaiah, 1908), Duhm (Yesaia, 1902, 1914), F. Praetorius and Guthe (1922). It seems that later editors have been unduly influenced by their predecessors, for it is by no means certain that the text in this instance needs correction.

We may perhaps pass by the suggestion of Praetorius that the first word למענכם 'For your sake' stands in need of emendation. The versions acknowledge it with one accord, and it is attested in sense by *vv.* 2, 3. Ewald finds difficulty in בריחים and in באניות, but the last clause, he says, becomes clear, if we read *ba-ănîyyoth* 'into sighs' for *bo-ŏnīyyoth* 'in ships'. Confident in the correctness of this reading he proceeds to emend בריחים 'fugitives' (or 'nobles', A.V.) in the preceding clause into בצריחים (a word of his own) 'in gestöhne', i. e. into moaning. A further objection which he makes is to the conjunction, '*and* the Chaldeans' (so A.V., '*even* the Chaldeans' R.V.), so long as the reading of M. T. is retained. So Ewald gives:

Euretwegen entbiete ich nach Babel und stürze in gestöhne ihre cither (כנרם for כלם), und der Chaldäer jubel in geseufze (. . . 'I turn into moaning their lyre and the rejoicing of the Chaldeans into sighing').

Ewald has not satisfied all his successors. His אניות 'sighing' is not found as he gives it, but as אניה, and his צריחים 'moaning' is a very doubtful word. Box says that the text is hopelessly corrupt. Duhm keeps the Chaldeans, omitting the ships. In בריחים he (wisely) finds no difficulty, though his explanation of it is open to question: '*Man kann lesen* בריחי כֶּלֶא', he says, and translates, 'Entsende ich nach Babel | und stosse herunter die Riegel ('the bars') des Gefängnisses'. But הורדתי is hardly the word to express the (literal) breaking of prison bars.

Let the reading of M. T. be examined afresh, beginning with the critical words באניות רנתם. The Chaldeans were the people of the lower reaches of Tigris and Euphrates, a river-faring and probably also a sea-faring population. In the thirteenth century of the Christian era their successors in the same part of the world fled from Hulâgu southward from Baghdad down the river in ships, as Ewald himself remarks. Sennacherib (Prism Inscription) in his account of his fourth campaign, which was against Babylon, says that Merodach-baladan put his gods on board ships (*ḳirib iṣu ilippati*) and deposited them in *Na-gi-ti-ra-ak-ki*, 'which is in the midst of the sea' (*sha ḳa-bal tam-tim*).

'Ships of their rejoicing' (R.V.) is an obvious translation of the two Hebrew words, but perhaps A.V. gives a better rendering '(the Chaldeans) whose cry is in the ships'. What ancient ship whether of oars or of sails was ever handled without much shouting? רנה 'rejoicing', sometimes has the more general sense of a loud cry, or crying.

Further אניות plur. 'ships' is a real word (Isa. lx 9), not an invention like Ewald's 'א 'sighing'.

In the phrase והורדתי בריחים 'I will bring them down . . . as *fugitives*' (R.V.) we may admit the small emendation of reading *bĕriḥim* 'bars' (Vulgate, *vectes*) for *bāriḥim* 'fugitives'. The 'bars' who hold the gates of Babylon against her assailants are her warriors. The same metaphor is used in Lam. ii 9, 'he hath destroyed and broken her bars': cf. Jer. li 30; Nahum iii 13.

The verb 'I will bring down' is exactly suitable in this context. The announcement is that the proud men, who should have defended Babylon, will be brought down from their pride and from their (apparently safe) seat. So in xlvii 1 Babylon is addressed in the words, 'Come down (רדי) and sit in the dust'.

Last to be considered is the copula, '*and* the Chaldeans'. The words 'I will bring down the defenders ("the bars") all of them *and* the Chaldeans' sound at first tautological. But *and* is used in Hebrew and in New Testament Greek also in the sense of *and especially*. The *and* of Isa. xliii 14 answers to the *καί* of Mark xvi 7, *εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ*: the *καί* is only for emphasis, for Peter was one of the disciples. Those fierce warriors the Chaldeans are singled out from the mass of the defenders of Babylon to be humbled.

The announcement made by the Prophet in JEHOVAH's name may therefore be paraphrased somewhat as follows:

'For the sake of you, my people Israel, who are held in captivity in Babylon, I have sent my servant Cyrus to Babylon to bring down to the ground the stout warriors who are called her "bars", yes, *all of them*, the warlike Chaldeans in their noisy ships among them.'

There is then no reason to question the correctness of the text on internal grounds. The passage as it stands yields good sense. But a reading may make sense, and yet be wrong. A rival reading may suit the passage better.

In the present instance there is no rival reading in the Hebrew, but it is possible that the rendering of the LXX points to a text which differed in two particulars from M. T. Instead of והורדתי 'and I will bring down' LXX perhaps found in their Hebrew text ועוררתי, *καὶ ἐπεγερῶ*, 'and I will stir up', or—the alternative is equally probable—they misread a faded or badly written והורדתי. But the rendering 'I will stir up all that flee' leaves the clause in the air: it has no proper connexion: scholars do not accept it, when they question M. T.

For the last clause 'The Chaldeans whose cry is in the ships' LXX B. has *Χαλδαῖοι ἐν πλοίοις δεθήσονται* The 'Chaldeans' and their 'ships' are recognized, but רנתם is rendered by *δεθήσονται*. This is most probably a mere conjecture. *To be bound* was the natural fate of those of the defeated side who were not slaughtered: cf. Isa. xxii 3, *οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἐν σοὶ ἐδέθησαν*. Captives in bonds are a favourite subject in ancient royal art. For πλοίοις LXX A. has κλοιοῖς 'collars' (used as bonds) but this reading is probably an accommodation to the verb δεθήσονται which follows. (The reading δοθήσονται of the Aldine edition is to be taken as a corruption of δεθ., and not as a witness to a Hebrew reading ינתנו, *Niphʻal*, for רנתם)

There is in short no helpful suggestion to be gathered from LXX. The readings of M. T. are manifestly superior. We may sum up by saying that the mention of Babylon justifies that of Chaldeans: 'Chaldeans' justifies 'ships': 'ships' justifies 'crying, shouting'.

Lastly in a denunciation of 'the lady of kingdoms', what verb could be more grimly significant than this, *I will bring thee down?* LXX (ἐπεγερῶ φεύγοντας πάντας) has nothing to the point like this.

W. Emery Barnes.

P.S. A. Dillmann, *Jesaia*, 1890, accepts M. T.

THE STICHOMETRY AND TEXT OF THE GREAT HALLEL

A Study and a Suggestion

I

Hermann Gunkel, whose new German commentary on the Psalms was published as recently as 1926, and C. A. Briggs, the second volume of whose *Book of Psalms* appeared in 1907, may be taken as roughly representing the two extreme ends in the scientific or critical treatment of the important liturgical Psalm cxxxvi or, as the Talmud designates it, the Great Hallel.[1]

---

[1] Cf. A. F. Kirkpatrick *The Book of Psalms* in Camb. Bible (1901), bks. iv and v p. 776: 'The Psalm [cxxxvi] was known in the liturgical language of the Jews as "the Great Hallel" . . . but the term was also applied to Ps. cxxxv 4—cxxxvi and to the whole group cxx–cxxxvi (Delitzsch).' Cf. also the Babylonian Talmud *Berakhoth* fol. 4 b. In *Babli Pesaḥim* fol. 118 a three opinions are recorded, viz. those of R. Yᵉhudah, R. Yoḥanan, and R. Aḥa,

‘מהיכן הלל הגדול ר׳ יהודה אומר מהודו (Ps. cxxxvi) עד על נהרות
בבל (Ps. cxxxvii) ורבי יוחנן אומר משיר המעלות (Ps. cxx) עד נהרות בבל רב
אחא בר יעקב אמר מכי יעקב בחר לו יה (Ps. cxxxv 4) עד נהרות בבל
(Ps. cxxxvii).’

but the *Šulḥan ʻArukh, ʻOraḥ Ḥayim'* chap. 480 (1) definitely accepts R. Yᵉhudah's opinion which considers Ps. cxxxvi as the Great Hallel,

‘הלל הגדול שהוא מהודו לה׳ (Ps. cxxxvi) עד על נהרות בבל (Ps. cxxxvii)
שהם כ״ו כי לעולם חסדו.’

Cf. the remark of the באר הגולה *ad loc.*

While Briggs[1] ruthlessly cuts down the twenty-six distichs or verses of our present text of the Psalm to two hexastichs or twelve lines, treating all the other forty stichoi as later additions or explanatory glosses, Gunkel[2] retains practically the entire text. The attempts of later scholars in this field only approximate to Briggs or Gunkel, and none, as will be shewn, has succeeded in presenting a metrically regular text of the Psalm and in satisfactorily explaining at the same time the apparent irregularities of metre or the seemingly superfluous words or feet.

König[3] (in 1900) treating the first half of each verse as a 'dreihebige Zeile' admits five metrical exceptions. 'In der That', he says, 'zeigt der erwähnte Psalm 136, abgesehen von der immer gleichen Zeile *Ki lᵉolám chasdô* 1b 2b 3b etc., nicht bloss dreihebige Zeilen in 2a 3a 5a 6a 7a 8a 10a 11a 13a 14a 16a 17a 18a 19a 20a 21a 22a 23a 25a 26a und darnach wahrscheinlich auch in 1a, sondern auch zweifellos vierhebige Zeilen in 4a 9a 12a 15a und eine zweihebige Zeile 24a.'

Kirkpatrick[4] (1901), though he thinks that Ps. cxxxvi is arranged in well-marked groups of three verses to the end of *v.* 18 after which follow two groups of four verses, adds that 'as *vv.* 19–20 are taken from Ps. cxxxv, and *v.* 25 is in no obvious connexion with the context, *it may be questioned whether the text is in order*'.[5]

Kittel[6] (in 1922), considering the metre of the Psalm as consisting on the whole of 3+2, also admits *unevenness*: 'auch hier', he asserts, 'hängen einzelne Unebenheiten im *metrum* (im ganzen 3+2) damit zusammen.'

Gunkel[7] (in 1926), who treats the Psalm generally as a 'Doppeldreier' (3+3), is also faced with three exceptions, viz. verses 4, 12, and 15, which he regards as 'Siebener' (4+3). His arrangement of the strophes too is far from regular. He assumes them to be as follows:—

Six strophes of 3 lines each,
Three „ „ 2 „ „
Two „ „ 1 line „

The largest number of equal strophes, according to Gunkel, it will be observed, occurs in the first six (*vv.* 1–18), which, following Bickell and others, he arranges as tristichs. But the formal link between the respective stichoi of each strophe or the distinguishing mark of separation of strophe from strophe that Gunkel can point out is that 'in der ersten strophe beginnt jede Zeile mit הודו, die folgenden strophen jedesmal mit einem *Particip im Dativ*'.[1] This, to say the least, is hardly convincing or satisfying. And even 'dies Gesetz der Anordnung', he is compelled to admit, 'wird von 19 an verlassen' for 'im folgenden gehören vielmehr je zwei Zeilen zusammen',[2] and *v.* '25 und 26 stehen für sich'.[3] He, as a matter of fact, goes so far as definitely to disagree with Duhm who attempted here 'Gleichmässigkeit der Strophen herzustellen'.[4]

---

[1] Cf. C. A. Briggs *The Book of Psalms* in *I.C.C.* vol. ii, 1907, pp. 481 ff.

[2] Cf. Hermann Gunkel *Die Psalmen* in *Göttinger Handkommentar zum A.T.*, Göttingen, 1926, pp. 576 ff.

[3] Cf. Ed. König *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik*, Leipzig, 1900, p. 343.

[4] Cf. A. F. Kirkpatrick *op. cit.* p. 776.

[5] The italics are mine.

[6] Cf. Rudolf Kittel *Die Psalmen*, Leipzig, 1922, p. 413.

[7] Cf. Gunkel *op. cit.* p. 577.

Powis Smith,[5] on the other hand, in his recent (1926) translation of the Psalms, arranges (as Baethgen in 1897) the whole of Ps. cxxxvi in twenty-six distichs, and, as will be apparent from the following quotation, considers each strophe to consist of two lines, giving, therefore, a total of twenty-six regular strophes to the Psalm. 'In many cases', he says in his note on the 'Poetry of the Psalter',[6] 'clearly marked groups of lines recur with such regularity as to make the presence of strophes practically indisputable. There is no fixed standard length for such strophes; they may consist of *two*,[7] four, six, eight, or more lines, as the taste of the poet and the structure of his thought may dictate.' And subsequently enumerating several Psalms in which 'the strophic structure is clearly marked' by 'the recurrence of refrains at certain intervals', he distinctly mentions Ps. cxxxvi. What Powis Smith makes of the metre of each distich and how he reconciles metrical irregularities in the Hebrew text cannot be gathered, of course, from the English translation. So that Powis Smith's guidance in the matter of strophe leaves us, as regards metre, no further on than where Gunkel has left us.

More authorities and opinions could be quoted; but enough has already been said to shew that in the case of Ps. cxxxvi there is hardly any general agreement either on the question of metre or on that of strophe, and, what is more disconcerting, that the student after spending many hours of study and research rises with a feeling of uncertainty and even bewilderment as to what the very text of the poem was like when first it was composed by the ancient psalmist or singer.

II

The difficulties encountered by the investigator of the *poetic forms* lie indeed no less heavily along the path of the investigation of the question of *text* and the determination as to what letters, syllables, or words actually appeared in the original composition.

---

[1] Italics mine. [2] With Ewald. [3] Gunkel *ibid.* [4] *Ibid.*

[5] Cf. J. M. Powis Smith *The Psalms*, The University of Chicago Press, 1926, p. 219 f.

[6] *Op. cit.*, Appendix A, iii p. 251. [7] Italics are mine.

Briggs's violent emendation[1] has already been mentioned. In pursuance of his theories, Briggs considers it probable that 'the Psalm had three stages in its developement: (1) the original composition was of two hexastichs without the refrain of the chorus; (2) it was enlarged to twenty-two lines with the chorus *vv.* 2–22, 25; (3) last of all it received the glosses *vv.* 1, 23, 24, 26'.[2] לבדו (in *v.* 4), despite the fact that it is found in the Versions, he considers as a gloss because the word makes the line too long.[3] Verses 8–9 are a gloss from Gen. i 16, 18. Verses 14–15 are explanatory glosses, *vv.* 19–20 are glosses of specification, *v.* 22 is a gloss, and *v.* 24a is of 'different construction from the original line and a dimeter'.[4] This is, no doubt, very drastic treatment, and not many would be prepared to follow such lead.

Gunkel, though retaining most of the text and distinctly disagreeing with Bickell, Baethgen, Duhm, and others who delete (in *v.* 4) נפלאות, גדלות, or לבדו,[5] nevertheless concurs with the first two and others in deleting (in *v.* 9) וכוכבים, and reads with them 'nach MSS G Hier. S' לְמֶמְשֶׁלֶת for לְמֶמְשְׁלוֹת.[6] His support for the emendation is based on the assumption that 'nur Sonne und Mond üben eine "Herrschaft" aus, aber nicht die Sterne'. But the only proof he adduces for his assumption is Gen. i 16. Hardly a proof, since 'the stars' (ואת הכוכבים) in that verse have no separate predicate and לממשלת הלילה (E. V. to rule the night) in the verse might refer to them as well as to the moon, just as the verb ויעש at the beginning of the verse (according to E. V.) refers to them and to the great lights,[7] the meaning being that 'not only the moon—but also the stars rule the night'. Gen. i 18 'and *to rule*[8] over the day and the night' obviously refers to the stars as well as to the sun and moon. In *v.* 15, quoting Baethgen who deletes וחילו, and

---

[1] In disagreeing with Briggs one is anxious to recall the well-deserved tribute paid to his scholarship by G. B. Gray: 'It so happens', Gray says, 'that I have mainly referred to details in Dr Briggs' work with which I disagree; the more reason, therefore, that I should recall the fact that in the subject . . . Dr Briggs was a true pioneer and that he was one of the first writers in English to insist,' etc. (*Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, London, 1915, p. 145.)

[2] Cf. Briggs *op. cit.* p. 482.

[3] Cf. *op. cit.* pp. 482 and 484.

[4] Cf. *op. cit.* p. 484.

[5] Gunkel *op. cit.* p. 577.

[6] *Loc. cit.* There is an apparent misprint in Gunkel's note. For his לְמְמְשֶׁלֶת, which is impossible, לְמֶמְשֶׁלֶת should be read as I tacitly corrected in the quotation above.

[7] Cf. the Jewish Translation, published in Philadelphia, 1917, where the italicized 'he made' of A. V. is omitted.

[8] Italics mine.

Bickell and Duhm who delete בים־סוף, Gunkel prefers indeed the present text,[1] but the preservation of the M. T. is obtained at the expense of the metre, since the distich thus becomes one of the exceptions: 4+3 in a Psalm which is on the whole, according to Gunkel himself, 3+3. Furthermore, though regarding the Psalm generally as a 'Doppeldreier' (3+3), Gunkel is reluctantly compelled to admit three exceptions. But really *v.* 24 too should be added to his exceptions. As it stands now it can hardly be regarded as a 'Doppeldreier'. Gunkel obtains regularity by stressing ויפרקנו twice.[2] Is this likely to have been the intention of the original composer who, even according to Gunkel, stressed other equally long words only once, e. g. מצרינו (*v.* 24), שבשפלנו (*v.* 23) or בבכוריהם (*v.* 10)?

It should be noted too that in the present text of the Psalm, which contains twenty-six distichs, no less than twenty-six stichoi consisting of the words כי לעולם חסדו are regular and may rightly be considered (as practically all scholars agree) as *threes*. The first stichoi of no less than twenty-one of these distichs, viz. *vv.* 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, are also clearly threes. Twenty-one complete distichs and five stichoi are, therefore, obviously in the metre of 3+3. Is it reasonable to maintain that the composer or singer quite unnecessarily (as will be shewn below) allowed five stichoi, viz. *vv.* 4^{a}, 9^{a}, 12^{a}, 15^{a}, and 24^{a}, to disturb the regular 3+3 metre of the whole poem by allowing the introduction of four 3+4 distichs and one 3+2?

III

I venture to suggest that the difficulties and irregularities mentioned here, as well as those of many other Biblical texts, could be removed without the necessity for any emendations, and that the text as preserved in M. T. may be taken in many a case, including that of Ps. cxxxvi, as correctly representing the original composition. With a slight rearrangement of a few isolated words the metre also appears in its regular and, therefore, probably original form as it presumably left the hand of the ancient composer, or, at least, as it was intended to be recited or sung at a certain period or on a certain occasion. In the course of the centuries many of the modes in which metrical compositions were sung or recited in Temple times or in the time of the prophets must have been forgotten; and if these could be re-discovered many an obscure text or apparently irregular metrical composition would undoubtedly appear in a new light. It will be attempted here to discover one or more of the modes in which the Great Hallel was sung or recited; and the method pursued will be partly that which I believe to be applicable to other texts of the Biblical writings, not only to those obviously poetic but even to those which now appear in prose form. 'Many Biblical passages', I said elsewhere,[1] 'which now appear in prose form were originally arranged in short lines in such a way as to avoid the necessity of the repetition of a word or phrase which belonged to both parts of a "parallelism".'[2] In the case of Ps. cxxxvi, as in the case of most of the Psalms and some other Biblical texts, the arrangement in short lines has already been attempted by many, though not in every case is this arrangement a happy one. 'So far as Hebrew poetry has come down to us by tradition', says William Henry Cobb,[3] 'a portion of it is fully metrical, another portion is unmetrical, and a third is partially metrical. It may be possible *at some future day*,[4] through textual criticism, higher criticism, and ingenious devices of various sorts, to bring the bulk of the two last classes under the first class; but *not one of the metrical systems thus far put forth has accomplished this result.*[4] If it is ever reached, it will only be by the labour of many workmen for many years.'[5] Ps. cxxxvi obviously comes under the first class mentioned, and the present writer, as has been said, feels that very little of 'textual emendation' and certainly none of the 'higher criticism' is needed for the presentation of the text in a metrically regular form.

---

[1] Gunkel *l. c.*

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 578, 'ויפרקנו is doppelbetont'.

Like the method of Bellermann, 'the father of genuine Hebrew metrics',[6] the method here adopted will avoid all 'subjective and fanciful' theories and, like his, will attempt to build 'soberly on the lines of the massoretic text'. But, though Bellermann is 'not averse to occasional emendation',[7] there is simply no need for that in the text of the Great Hallel.

IV

The following facts and probable conclusions should be taken into consideration.

(*a*) Ps. cxxxvi has long been recognized as a *liturgical composition* in which *two voices took alternate parts*: the priest and the choir, the singer and the congregation, or the priestly choir and the congregational choir, the one singing the first half of the verse, the other responding כי לעולם חסדו.

(*b*) Liturgical Psalms are in many instances *sung in the Synagogues*

---

[1] Cf. my note on 'Gen. iv 7 and a Form of Hebrew Poetry' in the *Expository Times*, April 1927, p. 329 f.

[2] Cf. *l. c.*

[3] Cf. W. H. Cobb *A Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metre*, Oxford, 1905, p. 185.

[4] Italics are mine.

[5] Cobb *op. cit.* p. 185.

[6] *Op. cit.* p. 186.

[7] *Ibid.*

of the present day in the same manner as Ps. cxxxvi was sung in Temple times, i.e. certain verses or lines are first sung or read by the שליח צבור or Reader and then are repeated by the congregation. There is no reason to doubt the probability that the Synagogue custom dates back to Temple times. It is certainly as old as the days of the Mishnah, in the tractate *Sukkah* of which we read

[1] מקום שנהגו לכפול יכפול

'where the custom is to repeat (certain verses of the Hallel[2]) he shall repeat'.[2] In the Babylonian Talmud[3] we find the following quotation from a Boraitha,

תנא רבי כופל בה דברים רבי אלעזר בן פרטא מוסיף בה דברים מאי מוסיף
אמר אביי מוסיף לכפול מאודך ולמטה.[3]

Rabbi's repetition, according to Rashi,[4] was that of Ps. cxviii 25, while the repetitions of R. El'azar, in accordance with the explanation of the Talmud itself,[5] were from Ps. cxviii 21 to the end of the Psalm. Israel Abrahams[6] mentions the possibility that 'the ancient custom was for the congregation to repeat each verse of the whole Hallel[7] after the Reader with the refrain Hallelujah'. Abrahams adds that 'the Talmudic information is not quite clear'.[8] It is obvious, however, that, whatever verses or words were actually repeated by Rabbi, R. El'azar, or others, the existence of a very old custom of repeating certain verses or words of the Psalms, as is the case with certain Psalms in the modern Synagogue service, is almost beyond any shadow of doubt.

(*c*) The portions to be repeated in the synagogal liturgy *do not appear in the text of the Psalms more than once*, and the fact that these particular lines are to be repeated is sometimes indicated and sometimes not.[9] Some Prayer Books contain a line of direction at the head of the Psalm; other books give after each line which is to be repeated the first word of the line; others give only the initials of the words to be repeated; while others still contain *no indication whatsoever*, the Reader and congregation nevertheless knowing quite well which lines or verses are or are not to be repeated. As examples of such antiphonal passages in the Synagogue liturgy may be cited Ps. xci 16, cxviii 1 (which is read by the Reader and repeated by the congregation and then again repeated antiphonally after *vv.* 2, 3, and 4),[1] cxviii 21–29,[2] and cl 6.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Mishnah *Sukkah* iii 11.

[2] The Egyptian Hallel consisting of Psalms cxiii–cxviii.

[3] Cf. Babli *Sukkah* fol. 39 a.

[4] Cf. Rashi *ad loc.* כופל בה דברים מאנא והלאה.

[5] Cf. Babli *Sukkah* fol. 39 a.

[6] Cf. Israel Abrahams's Annotated Edition of the *Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, London, 1914, p. clxxxvi.

[7] i.e. the Egyptian Hallel, *vide* note 2, *supra*.

[8] Cf. Abrahams *loc. cit.*

[9] Cf. Babli *Sukkah* fol. 38 b.

(*d*) That Ps. cxxxvi, the Great Hallel, was sung or recited in a similar manner, viz. that *some of its parts, though appearing once, were repeated more than once*, it is not unreasonable to expect. The Psalm was used in the liturgy as well as in private worship as much as, indeed more than, the antiphonal passages just quoted. Furthermore some forms of LXX, as represented by the Old Latin in the Gallican Psalter, actually contain at the end of the Psalm a repetition of *v.* 3.[4] Though the repetition is 'not found in any extant MS. of the LXX'[5] its occurrence in some of its old forms can quite easily be explained as a remnant of a certain mode of antiphonal reading or singing of the Psalm in ancient times.[6] Verse 3, or indeed the first three verses, might probably have been repeated by the choir or the congregation on certain occasions just as *v.* 1 of Ps. cxviii is on New Moons and Festivals repeated by the congregation after the Reader has sung or read each of the verses 1, 2, 3, and 4. And be it noted that *v.* 1 of Ps. cxviii, like *v.* 3 of Ps. cxxxvi, appears in the massoretic text *only once*.

---

[1] Cf. Tosaphoth, Babli *Sukkah*, *loc. cit.* and Abrahams *loc. cit.*, 'The present custom for the congregation to repeat "O give thanks" (הודו) after each of the first *four* verses of the Ps. cxviii is attested by the Tosaphat'.

[2] *V.* 25 of Psalm cxviii is sung or recited in the following manner: Reader, *v.* 25 a—Congregation repeat—Reader, again *v.* 25 a—Congregation repeat. *V.* 25 b is then taken in the same manner.

[3] Cf. the following passage from the Talmud shewing other modes of reciting Hallel Psalms,
הלכתא גיברתא איכא למשמע ממנהגא דהלילא הוא אומר הללויה והן אומרים
הללויה מכאן שמצוה לענות הללויה הוא אומר הללו עבדי ה' (Ps. cxiii) והן
אומרים הללויה מכאן שאם היה גדול מקרא אותו עונה אחריו הללויה הוא אומר
הודו לה' והן אומרים הודו לה' מכאן שמצוה לענות ראשי פרקים .... הוא
אומר אנא ה' הושיעה נא והן אומרים אנא ה' הושיעה נא מכאן שאם היה קטן
מקרא אותו עונין אחריו מה שהוא אומר הוא אומר אנא ה' הצליחה נא והן
אומרין אנא ה' הצליחה נא מכאן שאם בא לכפול כופל הוא אומר ברוך הבא והן
אומרים בשם ה' מכאן לשומע בעונה (Babli *Sukkah loc. cit.*) and cf. Rashi *ad loc.*,
תקנות הללו שתקנו נביאים לישראל.

[4] This repetition is retained also in the P. B. V.; cf. Kirkpatrick, *op. cit.* p. 776.

[5] Cf. Kirkpatrick *op. cit.* p. 779.

[6] The LXX Psalm cxvii (cxviii) contains also a repetition of a verse which is not so repeated in the Hebrew. It repeats, namely, *v.* 21 after *v.* 28, while the the Hebrew of M. T. gives the verse only once. Bearing in mind, however, that in the Synagogal liturgy *v.* 21 is actually repeated (as mentioned above), the repetition in LXX is easily explainable as representing a certain mode of antiphonal reading which in this case is the very reading used in Jewish worship and continued to the present day.

(*e*) Another important point in this connexion is the fact that many Prayer Books do not contain even כי לעולם חסדו, the refrain of Ps. cxxxvi, more than once, viz. after the first line of the Psalm; and the fact that the refrain is to be repeated after the following lines is indicated by the repetition of its initials only. It is quite probable, therefore, that many MSS, in order to economize space,[1] had כי לעולם חסדו not more than once, while the first lines of each of the following distichs in the MS closely followed one another. A clear instance of such a case actually occurs in M. T., Ps. cxxxv 11–12 and cxxxvi 19–22. The first lines of the four distichs commencing לסיחון (*vv.* 19–22), which in this Psalm are separated from each other by the refrain כי לעולם חסדו, appear (with the addition of three words) in *close succession* in Ps. cxxxv 11–12—a fact which suggests that Ps. cxxxvi 19–22 is only another version of Ps. cxxxv 11–12, and the further probability that Ps. cxxxvi is only a liturgical collection of stichoi (from Ps. cxxxv and others) to each of which has been added 'the beloved refrain'.[2] Graetz goes so far as to consider the whole of Ps. cxxxvi as a variation and partial repetition of Ps. cxxxv adapted 'für den liturgischen Zweck'.[3] It is quite probable, therefore, that two or more versions of the Psalm existed side by side: Ps. cxxxv containing fragments of the original without the refrain, and Ps. cxxxvi representing the same Psalm as it was sung or recited in the liturgy always or on certain occasions. It follows that, just as in the case of, e. g. Ps. cxviii 1–4, 21–29, we have some Prayer Books which repeat the verses antiphonally, while others (relying on the knowledge of the congregation and the Reader) do not, *so in the case of the contents of Ps. cxxxvi some MSS* (fortunately preserved in Ps. cxxxv) *contained the original only* (relying on the knowledge of the priests and Levites and the worshippers to supply the refrain) *while others contained the text and the refrain* (preserved in Ps. cxxxvi) as recited or sung in the liturgy.

V

Before applying the conclusions derived from what has been said to the entire text of the Psalm under discussion two words in the Psalm, viz. לבדו and לממשלת, require some consideration.

---

[1] As a matter of fact, a Passover *Hagadah* MS in the John Rylands Library (Hebrew MSS, No. 7) examined by me actually confirms the suggestion above. In Ps. cxxxvi it gives the refrain only once (after the first stichos) and the other stichoi are followed by the initials כ׳ ל׳ ח׳ only.

[2] Cf. 1 Macc. iv 24 and the following. 'This phrase *O give thanks* and the rest of the line was quite early a beloved refrain on the lips of the Temple singers as may be seen from several passages in Chronicles (e. g. 2 Chron. v 13). The refrain was equally a favourite in the mouths of the people' (Abrahams *loc. cit.*).

[3] Cf. H. Graetz *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Psalmen*, Breslau, 1882, p. 661.

לבדו in *v.* 4, as has been noted above, makes the line too long and disturbs the 3 + 3 metre, while

ויפרקנו מצרינו

(*v.* 24) is too short. If לבדו is transferred from *v.* 4 to *v.* 24 we obtain two regular distichs of 3 + 3 in both places. The LXX, curiously enough, adds לבדו, *μόνῳ*, also after

לעשה אורים גדולים Ps. cxxxv (cxxxvi) 7

a fact which might be taken as an indication that the word was repeated in the liturgy several times and as a further support to the suggestion made above that words appearing in the Hebrew only once were repeated in the liturgy more than once.

לממשלות in *v.* 9, as a plural with *Waw*, has not much support in the Versions and ancient MSS. A number of Hebrew MSS, including those of *c.* 1150 and *c.* 1250 as well as the first edition of the Hebrew Bible (Soncino, 1488), read

לממשלת

without the *Waw*, while six Kennicott-De Rossi MSS, Syriac, Targum, and LXX read לממשלת (*l^ememšeleth*) as a *singular*.[1] Considering that the LXX occasionally sheds light on Jewish worship[2] and that 'there is no doubt that in isolated passages it preserves a text which only a *knowledge of the ritual*[3] elucidates and proves to be correct',[4] one has no hesitation in adopting the reading לממשלת in the singular. This reading, in addition to the fact that it is found in the LXX, is also supported, as has been said, by the Syriac, Targum, and a number of Hebrew MSS. The value of this reading for the metre and text of the Psalm will soon be apparent.[5]

We may now summarize.

(1) The Synagogal liturgy to the present day includes Psalms, portions of which are recited or sung antiphonally; and there is reason to assume that the custom dates back to Temple times.

(2) Portions which are repeated antiphonally more than once appear in the text, in many cases, only once.

(3) Psalm cxxxvi is a liturgical Psalm which at different periods or on certain occasions was sung or recited in different ways: some words or lines being repeated on one occasion, while others were repeated on other occasions.

(4) Words, phrases, and lines appearing in a text only once may, for

---

[1] Cf. C. D. Ginsburg *The Writings*, London, 1926, *ad loc.*

[2] Cf. H. St John Thackeray *Some Aspects of the Greek O.T.*, London, 1927, p. 51 f.

[3] Italics mine.

[4] *Op. cit.* p. 52.

[5] Cf. also Gunkel, *supra*, note 6 p. 258, and Baethgen *Die Psalmen*, in Nowack's H. A. T. Göttingen, 1897, p. 398.

liturgical or similar purposes,[1] have been recited or sung more than once.

(5) Words, phrases, and lines appearing more than once in extant liturgical texts may have appeared in the original composition only once.

(6) Psalm cxxxv 11–12 and Psalm cxxxvi 19–22 form an example of the existence of more than one version of the same Psalm or Hymn, the latter shewing one of the ways the Psalm was used for liturgical or similar purposes.

(7) Many Biblical passages were originally arranged in such a manner as to avoid the necessity of the repetition of a word or phrase which belonged to both parts of a parallelism or to a number of consecutive lines.

VI

These conclusions easily lead to the following probabilities in regard to Ps. cxxxvi.

V. 4, which in the present text,

לעשה נפלאות גדלות לבדו

is metrically too long, may have been sung or recited in the following manner:—

3 + 3	לעשה נפלאות גדלות	כי לעולם חסדו
3 + 3	„ „ לבדו[2]	„ „ „

or

3 + 3	לעשה נפלאות גדלות	כי לעולם חסדו
3 + 3	[3] נפלאות גדלות לבדו	„ „ „

---

[1] This economy in words may be due to considerations of space or time at the disposal of the ancient scribe. Cf. Ewald, 'The oldest manuscripts were written stichically, and the present form of printing Hebrew poetry grew out of the desire to save space'. (W. H. Cobb *A Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metre*, Oxford, 1905, p. 71.)

[2] Cf. LXX reading, quoted above, which has לבדו, *μόνῳ*, not only in *v.* 4 but also in *v.* 7, which verse may have been recited in a manner similar to that of *v.* 4:

3 + 3	לעשה אורים גדלים	כי לעולם חסדו
3 + 3	אורים גדלים לבדו	„ „ „

[3] For a similar repetition of the last portion of a line at the beginning of the following line, cf. *vv.* 21 and 22 of this Psalm:—

ונתן ארצם לנחלה
נחלה לישראל עבדו

where נחלה occurs at the end of one line and at the beginning of the line that follows. (It may also be mentioned here that four MSS read the first לנחלה as נחלה without the *Lamed.*) Cf. Ginsburg *loc. cit.*

v. 9 may have been sung or recited as follows:—

3 + 3 את־הירח לממשלת[1] בלילה   כי לעולם חסדו.
3 + 3 וכוכבים " "   " " "

v. 15 read

3 + 3 ונער פרעה בים־סוף   כי לעולם חסדו
3 + 3 " הילו " "   " " "

or

3 + 3 ונער פרעה וחילו   כי לעולם חסדו
3 + 3 [2] פרעה וחילו בים־סוף   " " "

The stichos,

ביד־חזקה ובזרוע נטויה

(*v.* 12), though it seemingly consists of four stresses,[3] may easily be reduced to three by treating ביד־חזקה as one. Fourteen MSS and four early editions, as a matter of fact, shorten ביד by placing a *Pathaḥ* under the *Yod* instead of the *Ḳāmeṣ*.[4]

The modes in which the Psalm may have been recited or sung for liturgical or similar purposes are many.[5] הודו, for instance, might have been repeated not only with *vv.* 1, 2, 3, and 26 (as in our present Hebrew text) but with many of the others, e.g.

with *v.* 4,

הודו לעשה נפלאות
נפלאות גדלות לבדו.

with *v.* 5,

הודו לעשה השמים
לעשה השמים בתבונה.

with *v.* 6,

הודו לרוקע הארץ
לרוקע הארץ על־המים.

and similarly with *vv.* 7, 10, 13, 16, and 17.

למכה may have preceded not only מלכים גדלים (in *v.* 17), but also *vv.* 15 and 18 giving the readings

למכה פרעה וחילו,
למכה מלכים אדירים.

---

[1] Cf. the reading of the MSS, *supra*.

[2] Cf. note 3 p. 265.

[3] Cf. Gunkel, '12 ist ein deutlicher Siebener' (*op. cit.* p. 577).

[4] Cf. Ginsburg *loc. cit.*

[5] Cf. 'Es ist meines Erachtens zunächst zu betonen, dass solche liturgische Gesänge schwerlich nur ein- oder das anderemal gesungen werden sollten, sondern *immer wieder* . . .' (Kittel *op. cit.* p. 411).

while ויהרג (*v.* 18) may have been recited also with *vv.* 15 and 17,

ויהרג פרעה וחילו
ויהרג מלכים גדלים.

and so on..

VII

In the light of the conclusions arrived at, Ps. cxxxvi as preserved in M. T. might represent that version which was in use when the Hymn was sung or recited in a manner somewhat like the following[1]:—

CHOIR *or* CONGREGATION, ETC.	PRIEST *or* READER, ETC.		
כ́י לע́ולם חס́דו	הוד́ו לה́' כי־ט́וב	(1)	3+3
„ „ „	„ לאלה́י האלה́ים	(2)	3+3
„ „ „	„ לאדנ́י האדנ́ים	(3)	3+3
„ „ „	לעש́ה נפלא́ות גד́לות	(4)	3+3
„ „ „	נפלא́ות גד́לות לבד́ו[2]	(4 A)	3+3
„ „ „	לעש́ה השמ́ים בתבונ́ה	(5)	3+3
„ „ „	לרוק́ע הא́רץ על־המ́ים	(6)	3+3
„ „ „	לעש́ה או́רים גד́לים	(7)	3+3
„ „ „	את־השמ́ש לממש́לת בי́ום	(8)	3+3
„ „ „	את־הי́רח לממש́לת בל́ילה	(9)	3+3
„ „ „	וכוכ́בים „ „	(9 A)	3+3
„ „ „	למכ́ה מצ́רים בבכו́ריהם	(10)	3+3
„ „ „	ויצ́א ישרא́ל מתוכ́ם	(11)	3+3
„ „ „	ביד־חזק́ה ובזר́וע נטו́יה	(12)	3+3
„ „ „	לגז́ר ים־ס́וף לגזר́ים	(13)	3+3
„ „ „	והעב́יר ישרא́ל בתוכ́ו	(14)	3+3

---

[1] The omission of certain words from the text was quite legitimate in accordance with conclusions 4 and 7, *supra*, and cf. note 1 p. 265, *supra*.

[2] Or לעשה נפלאות גדלות
לבדו „ „

3+3	(15)	ונער פרעה וחילו	כי לעולם חסדו
3+3	(15 A)	פרעה וחילו בים־סוף[1]	„ „ „
3+3	(16)	למוליך עמו במדבר	„ „ „
3+3	(17)	למכה מלכים גדלים	„ „ „
3+3	(18)	ויהרג מלכים אדירים	„ „ „
3+3	(19)	לסיחון מלך האמרי	„ „ „
3+3	(20)	ולעוג מלך הבשן	„ „ „
3+3	(21)	ונתן ארצם לנחלה	„ „ „
3+3	(22)	נחלה לישראל עבדו	„ „ „
3+3	(23)	שבשפלנו זכר לנו	„ „ „
3+3	(24)	ויפרקנו מצרינו לבדו[2]	„ „ „
3+3	(25)	נתן לחם לכל־בשר	„ „ „
3+3	(26)	הודו לאל השמים	„ „ „

The question whether הודו (*vv.* 1, 2, 3, 26) appeared in all MSS four times, whether *למםשלת* (*vv.* 8, 9, 9A) appeared only twice or three times, and whether other words to be repeated were actually written once or more than once, need not detain us any longer, since the repetition of a word in, or its omission from, a MS depended entirely on the space and time at the disposal of the respective scribes, while the mode of reciting or singing the Psalm was quite independent of the number of times the word or words appeared in script. But the above presentation of the Great Hallel, in which practically not a single word of M. T. has been omitted or altered, amply illustrates the probability that (*a*) Psalm cxxxvi was meant to be recited or sung as a 3 + 3 metrical composition, that (*b*) it consists of twenty-nine distichs and (if strophe is to be looked for in the Psalm) of an equal number of strophes, and that (*c*) as regards the form of Hebrew poetry it is one of the most regular poems in Biblical poetical literature.

ISRAEL W. SLOTKI.

[1] Or ונער פרעה בים־סוף
„ חילו „ „

[2] Or ויפרקנו לבדו מצרינו

THE MSS OF 'NARSAI ON THE MYSTERIES'

In the year 1909 Dom R. H. Connolly published, in the well-known series called 'Texts and Studies', English translations of the Liturgical Homilies of Narsai, the Nestorian Doctor who died soon after A. D. 500. The book, with its careful Notes and the Additional Notes contributed by the late Mr Edmund Bishop, at once took rank as a primary document for the study of Christian Worship in the East.[1] But there was one point that was unsatisfactory. Of the four Homilies translated by Dom Connolly from the Syriac text of the 47 Homilies which had been published by A. Mingana at Mosul in 1905, the most important (Mingana's no. xvii, Connolly's A) is not apparently found in any ancient collection of works by Narsai. All Dom Connolly could do was to repeat Dr Mingana's rather vague account of his manuscript authorities. Homily xvii (the 'Exposition of the Mysteries') was not in the MSS from which Mingana had derived most of his text: he owed it 'benevolentiae D. Chikouana sacerdotis Alkoch'. Further, Dr Mingana had removed two passages from his text, giving them separately in his Introduction (Connolly, pp. 14 and 20), as the plan of his work had been to put *nil acatholicum* in the text itself.

This was bad enough, but what made it worse was that some 'Chaldean' authorities seemed to know of the elusive Homily xvii and to ascribe it to 'the pious Mar 'Abdisho', Metropolitan of Elam', a worthy of the 13th century. This personage is mentioned by Assemani (B. O. ii 453) under the year A.D. 1222.[2] Thus there has hung over the Homily, which is a liturgical document of the first importance, the taint of alleged illegitimacy. Dom Connolly did a great deal to remove the stain by his admirable arguments from style and the absence of rhyme (pp. xv–xxxviii). These arguments make it very difficult to believe that the Homily, as published by Mingana and translated by Connolly, can be by any one but Narsai or one of his immediate followers and imitators, and they make it clear that it is very ancient. But all the same its genealogy was not so satisfactory as might have been wished.

The immediate cause of this present paper was the chance discovery that the University Library at Cambridge possesses two MSS of Homily xvii. They have indeed been there ever since 1888, and duly appear in Wright's *Catalogue* (published in 1901) as Additional MSS 1977 and 2818. My belated discovery led me to look further, and I found (as might be expected) that Professor Baumstark knew all, or nearly all, about it. Speaking of the works of Narsai he says[1]: 'A comprehensive Exposition of the Syriac Liturgy in poetical form . . . is preserved under Narsai's name, and also both under the name of an 'Abdisho' of Elam and as anonymous', adding in a footnote:

---

[1] See *J. T. S.* xi 315 and xii 319 for appreciations of its importance.

[2] Elam (ܥܝܠܡ) is the ecclesiastical name for Gondeshapur.

> 10) Hss unter dem Namen des 'A.: Séert 76 (13. Jh); Dijarb 67 (16. Jh) 2°. Urm 21 (17/18. Jh). VtB 90 (J 1867) 1°. BrlOrqu 967, mit anonymer Überlieferung: CmbrAdd 1977 (J 1728) IV°. 2818 (18. Jh) II°. Séert 44 (beigebunden). 122. 2°. N-Dsém 80. 1°. 82 (J 1894) 1°.

A translation of this may perhaps not be out of place! It tells us that Prof. Baumstark knows of five MSS of our Homily which assign it to 'Abdisho', and six in which it is anonymous. The 'Abdisho' MSS are according to Baumstark:

1. Séert 76, of the 13th cent. (see below).
2. Diarbekr 67, of the 16th cent.
3. Urmi 21, of the 17th or 18th cent.
4. Vatican, Borgia 90, dated A.D. 1867.
5. Berlin, Oriental-quarto 967.

Of these the Séert MS is much the most important, from its age. 'Séert' means the Library of the Chaldean Archbishop of Séert (ܣܥܪܬ), a place in Kurdistan about half-way between Diarbekr and Mosul. Mgr A. Scher's *Catalogue* (Mosul, 1905) tells us that the MS contains some works of Isaac of Nineveh, followed by an account of 'Sainte Anasime',[2] some work of Abraham of Nethpar, and finally 'un Poème d'Ébedjésus, métropolitain de Ilam, sur la grandeur du St Sacrifice de la Messe. Il y manque un ou plusieurs cahiers; car ce même poème se trouve plus au long dans d'autres manuscrits, où il figure sans nom d'auteur (Voir Cod. 122. 2°). Quelques-uns l'attribuent plus vraisemblement à Narsai. Le poème commence par ces mots:

ܒܐܪ̈ܙܝ، ܒܥܕܬܐ ܡܪܟܘ ܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܝ، ܐܪ̈ܙܢܝܬ."

All this makes it quite clear that Séert 76 really does contain our Homily, that it ascribes it to 'Abdisho' of Elam, and that it is the same 'liber Isaac Catarensis' which Mingana (quoted by Connolly, p. xii) mentions in his Preface.[3] What is not quite clear from Mgr Scher's method of describing the MSS is whether there is any prefatory matter in the MS before the Homily proper begins.

Of the other Homilies I have not been able to find out anything about nos. 3 and 5. I gather from Mgr Scher's description that Borgia 90 is really anonymous, and I am doubtful about Diarbekr 67.[4]

---

[1] A. Baumstark *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922) p. 112.

[2] Usually called in English 'Onesima'.

[3] Isaac of Nineveh came from Beth Ḳaṭrāyā.

[4] i.e. it is not quite clear from Scher's description whether the ascription to 'Abdisho' is in the MS itself.

The anonymous MSS enumerated by Baumstark are:

6. Cambridge, Add. 1977, dated 1728.
7. Cambridge, Add. 2818, of the 18th cent.
8. Séert 44, bound up with an 18th cent. MS.
9. Séert 122, dated A.D. 1664, following a work of Simeon of Amid.
10. Notre Dame des Sémences (north of Mosul) 80, no date.
11. Notre Dame des Sémences (north of Mosul) 82, dated 1894.

To these MSS should be added:

12. British Museum, Add. 18716, of the 15th or (early) 16th cent.

This last, which is in Wright *CBM* p. 901, is not a Nitrian MS, but came from a small collection once belonging to 'the Metropolitan Zäitūn' (A.D. 1848). Its text is almost exactly the same as that of no. 7.

So much for the list of MSS. What I desire now to point out is that in those I have been able actually to examine, viz. 6, 7, and 12, the Homily (beg. ܒܐܪ̈ܙܝ، ܕܥܕܬܐ) is not given alone, but is preceded by an Introduction and is 'farsed' with certain additions. It will be convenient to describe these now in detail.

First comes a short proem—three stanzas of rhymed verse in 6, half a dozen lines of prose in 7 and 12—then an explanatory paragraph beginning with ܠܘܩܕܡ ܕܝܢ (i. e. 'firstly'), in which it is noted that 'these are the rites (ܛܟ̈ܣܐ) which are performed at the awful moment of their hallowing, and how one signifies and sets forth each one of the rites, according to the mind of Mar Theodore the Interpreter, of pious memory, which is in a great codex (ܦܢܩܝܬܐ) of liturgical commentary made by one of the holy Doctors when in retreat during the holy week of our Lord's Fast, and there came to him an idea of the greatness of the holy Mysteries . . . and he composed this Homily for his own profit and for that of all who come across this marvellous Homily (ܡܐܡܪܐ ܬܗܝܪܐ)', &c. This is followed by a Preface (ܦܘܬܕܐ), in which future Readers are warned when declaiming the Homily not to alter a syllable either through haste or misunderstanding, and to remember the thousands and myriads of angels that stand round the Altar, lest when they approach it they incur the condemnation set before us by St Paul (1 Cor xi 29).

After this the Homily begins thus:—

ܗܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܪܝܢܢ ܠܗ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܢܐ ܒܥܘܕܪܢܗ ܕܡܪܢ܆
ܘܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܒܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܕܡܪܝ، ܢܪܣܝ ܛܘܒܢܐ ܐܪܬܘܕܘܟܣܐ
ܘܓܒܝܐ ܀ ܒܐܪ̈ܙܝ، ܕܥܕܬܐ ܗܘܪܓܗ ܣܥܪ ܐܪܙܢܝܬ. ܘܟ'

Now then we begin this Homily with our Lord's help: and it is in the 2nd metre of Blessed Mar Narsai, the orthodox and elect:—
On the Mysteries of the Church my thoughts mystically pondered, &c.

Except for the three stanzas of verse in 6 the three MSS agree word for word. In mentioning Theodore 6 and 7 call him 'Bishop of Mopsuestia', 12 omits 'of Mopsuestia'. Narsai is called 'Blessed' in 6 and 12, 'Doctor' in 7. Otherwise there is complete agreement. The '2nd Metre' is a known Nestorian term for the 12-syllable metre, associated by Jacobites with the name of Jacob of Serug, in which our Homily is written.[1]

Before going any further I should like to point out that all this is a very familar form of literature. It is an Editor's Introduction to a 'classic'. Unless the whole thing be an elaborate mystification the treatise or homily 'On the Mysteries' is an ancient and valued work, which the Editor can praise freely while proclaiming his own feebleness and unworthiness.

This conclusion is fully borne out by the rest of the text as it stands in these MSS. I have not noted the variants of no. 12 in full, but in all essentials, even as to the placing of rubrics and insertions, it agrees with the Cambridge MSS. I have not fully collated either codex, but am fairly sure that no point of major interest is omitted.

P. 3 of Connolly's ed., line 6 from end, where Dom Connolly remarks in a note 'The context would seem to require "deacons"', 6 has the sing., 7 the plural.

P. 5, ll. 14 ff., all three MSS have the passage given between † . . . †.

P. 11, l. 17 f. 'before the mystery thereof', 6 has ܐܪܙܗ, as in Connolly's text, 7 reads ܐܪܙܐ, i.e. omits 'thereof'.

P. 14, l. 4, all three MSS omit Connolly's '(and)', and at the end of the line add ܒܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ: ܐܬܚܝܕ: ܠܗ. followed of course by the passage between † . . . †. In other words Dr Mingana in removing the † . . . † passage from the text to a footnote dropped out one line. Translate, for line 4:

> Through (God's) good pleasure the whole Trinity concurred, but in person the Word only was united with it (the body).

In the next line 7 drops two half-lines, making nonsense.

P. 14, l. 12, is omitted by both Cambridge MSS, probably rightly.

P. 14, l. 7 from end. Here the MSS insert a long rubric.

P. 20, l. 9. Nestorius, not Barsamya, is in 6 and 7.

P. 20, ll. 19 ff. (The long passage between † . . . †.) Here again Dr Mingana has omitted a line, and he did not indicate the right place for its insertion The omitted line comes really after 'wine' (p. 20, l. 3 from end), and runs

---

[1] The term occurs further down in our MSS, after one of the Editor's insertions (Connolly, p. 31, line 17); also B.M. Add. 25876 (Wright *CBM* 1178, l. 4). The 7-syllable line is called the 4th metre in this notation. In B. N. syr. 283 (fol. 158 v, *Zotenberg*, p. 216) the 12-syllable metre seems to be called the metre of Narsai.

ܢܚܬ ܪܘܚܐ ܘܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܠܗ ܠܦܓܪܐ ܘܕܡܐ.

The Spirit descends and consecrates the Body and Blood.[1]

The MSS after 'of our Lord Jesus' (p. 20, l. 19) go on to 'These things' (p. 20, last line but one), the passage between † . . . † occurring after 'divine operation' (p. 21, l. 5). This is followed by a long prose insertion by the Editor, who quotes Theodore, before going on to 'The Spirit comes down at the request of the priest'.

P. 31, l. 25. Both 6 and 7 read *lā*, 'not', where Connolly suggests *lāh*, 'to it'. I think the MSS are right: the reference no doubt is to 1 Cor. xi 28, but ܓܪܡ means not to 'enjoin' but to 'threaten evil'. Translate:

> 'that thou mayest not approach in the manner that the apostle Paul pronounced accursed'.

It should be noted here that the four lines at the end (p. 32), which begin 'I confessed', are two rhyming couplets, so that perhaps we should put them down to the Editor rather than the Homilist.

Now let us go back to the beginning of the Introduction. In 7 and 12 the work is introduced by

> [In the *power* of our Lord Jesus Christ we *begin to write*] *a marvellous treatise* (ܡܐܡܪܐ ܬܗܪܐ) *on the greatness of the Holy Mysteries which are done in the* Holy *Church of the Nestorians, which holds that* true *Confession which was composed by the holy* and truly orthodox *Fathers.*[2]

In place of this we find in 6 the following stanzas

1. ܬܘܒ ܥܠ ܚܝܠܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܡܚܠܝܐ ܓܒܝܪܐ.
ܡܪܝܐ ܒܒܪܐ ܡܫܝܠܐ ܘܥܩܠܐ ܘܦܠܡܐܐ ܘܪܒܪܐ.
ܠܡܟܬܒ ܐܢܐ ܫܪܝܬ ܘܠܡܬܪܓܡ ܒܠܫܢܐ ܘܣܦܪܐ.
ܒܬܘܒܬܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܠܠ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܬܗܪܐ ⁘

2. ܥܠ ܪܒܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܘܡܚܣ̈ܢܐ.
ܐܦ ܡܕ̈ܒܚܐ ܘܩܘܕܫܐ ܓܡܪ ܘܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܐ.
ܕܒܡܪܐ ܥܕܬܐ ܐܪܬܘܕܘܟܣܘ ܕܢܣܛܘ̈ܪܝܢܐ.
ܬܘ̈ܪܝ، ܥܒܝܕܐ ܘܠܦ̈ܪܝ، ܒܣܘܒܐ ܥܙ̈ܝܙ ܦܘܩ̈ܕܢܐ ⁘

---

[1] Perhaps it would avoid controversy to translate the verb by 'completes', using 'perfects' for ܓܡܪ in the next line, but I think ܡܫܡܠܝܐ has here the technical meaning 'ordain' or 'consecrate'.

[2] Cod. 7 omits the words in brackets. The words in italics are those which recur in the stanzas of cod. 6.

3. ܐܚܝܕ̈ܝ ܕܝܢ ܫܪܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܗܝ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ.
ܕܐܬܬܣܝܡܬ ܠܗ̇ ܡܢ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ.
ܫܦܝ̈ܐ ܘܟܐ̈ܢܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܕܘܟܪܢܗܘܢ ܠܥܠ ܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܐ.
ܡܪܝ ܒܪ̈ܚܡܝܟ ܥܕܪ ܠܥܘܠܐ ܥܒܕܐ ܠܫܘܪܬܐ ܀ ܐܡܝܢ ܀

1. Now in reliance on the perfect power Divine
'ABDA the weak and foul and worthless dares incline
His feeble pen to write and transcribe line by line
A treatise—rather say, a precious treasure-mine.

2. A treatise dealing with the Mysteries glorious,
Holy and pure, life-giving and victorious,
Done in the Orthodox Church of Mar NESTORIUS,
True to its faith and loving and laborious.

3. Undauntedly it holds the truth, for it is stayed
On that Confession which the holy Fathers made,
Saints and just men, whose memory can never fade.
Lord, to the end this sinful wretch in mercy aid! Amen.

I give this doggerel in full, partly in order that the English reader may appreciate better the difference between the writer of it and the author of the Homily itself, which has been so well translated by Dom Connolly. These stanzas are rhymed and the lines have been filled out for the sake of the metre in quite a different style from the characteristic rhetorical repetitions of the Homily. But I venture to suggest that it is the original from which the few prose lines at the beginning of 7 and 12 have been compiled, not *vice versa*. The rhymester was evidently called 'Abd-*something*, and I venture to suggest that he was really 'Abdisho' of Elam, the *editor* (not the *author*) of the ancient 'marvellous treatise'.

What we seem to have, then, in the MS tradition is an edition of the ancient Homily on the Greatness of the Mysteries, prepared by 'Abdisho', Metropolitan of Elam about A. D. 1222. The edition consisted in a set of prefaces, the insertion of rubrics in the text, and also some additions which were almost entirely in prose. One of these is concerned with the necessity of some form of testifying penitence before attending the Eucharist, a topic which formed no part of the original Homily.

In the Edition Narsai's name was mentioned just before the beginning of the Homily, but only by way of naming the metre. The authorship therefore, unless there be some note extant in the MS at Séert (no. 76), must be inferred from internal evidence, and Dom Connolly has shewn how strongly this internal evidence points to Narsai.

I conclude by an extract from a letter Dom Connolly wrote to me while this paper was being prepared. He says:

> 'As to the antiquity of the Homily there is a point worth noting, which I have just indicated at the end of my Introduction (p. xli, note 4): "The mere fact that A [Homily xvii, discussed in this paper] treats only of the *missa fidelium* strikes me as a note of antiquity". What I meant was (though this only occurred to me at the last moment) that the Homilies A, B, C, are really *catechetical instructions* like those of Cyril of Jerusalem—and indeed all three of them seem to shew acquaintance with Cyril's Catecheses (see p. 28, note 4; p. 38, note 1; p. 51, note 2).
>
> 'In A (Hom. xvii) the author is, I believe, addressing those who have just witnessed the Mysteries for the first time. They had seen all the earlier part as catechumens often before, and so he has nothing to say about it, but begins with the dismissal of the unbaptized and non-communicants. Later people, like "George of Arbel" (cf. also George of the Arab Tribes, and Bar Kepha), go through the whole from beginning to end, but the Catechists don't. They only deal first with baptism and then with the "Mysteries" or central part of the Mass. Such instructions were absolutely necessary, as nothing could be said about the "Mysteries" during the time of catechumenate. Hence all such—Cyril's, Ambrose's, the *De Sacramentis*—have this limitation of scope.'

The conclusion is, that our Homily was composed while the Catechumenate was still a living institution.

F. C. BURKITT.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(*continued*).

IX. *Lexical notes on* (1) *some ἅπαξ λεγόμενα: words used once in Mark, and nowhere else in the Gospels*: (2) *some words or phrases of common occurrence in Mark but rare in Matthew or Luke.*[1]

(1)

ἀποστερεῖν.

MARK x 19 μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς. The word occurs among the list of the Commandments, and is clearly intended to be one of them: but because it does not in terms correspond to the Old Testament lists, it is dropped by both Matthew and Luke. It is quite certainly genuine, and is indeed presumably the source of the inclusion of 'fraud' among irremissible sins in the penitential discipline of the early Western Church. If *μὴ πορνεύσῃς* (after *μὴ μοιχεύσῃς*) at the beginning of the Marcan list is, as I suspect, genuine, then just as the Seventh Commandment is extended to include fornication, so here we may suppose the Eighth is extended to include fraud as well as literal theft.

---

[1] The notes that follow are rather miscellaneous in character, but I hope that they may be found to present not a few points of interest.

For the use of *ἀποστερεῖν* in non-Christian writers I need do no more than refer to Field's admirable note *ad loc.* (*Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* p. 33): its technical meaning is that of holding back 'money or goods deposited with another for safe keeping'. But it is, I think, worth while to add some references from Christian writers, or in one case from a non-Christian writer in relation to Christian ethics; and with that object I begin by shewing that the earliest Latin rendering of *ἀποστερεῖν* is *abnegare.*

Mark x 19 'ne abnegaueris' *k*, 'non abnegabis' *a c.* Hermas *Mand.* iii 2 *ἀποστερηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου*, lat. 'abnegant Dominum': *Mand.* viii 5 *ἀποστέρησις*, lat. 'ab abnegantia'. We can therefore confidently assume that where we find 'abnegare' in an appropriate context, it corresponds to *ἀποστερεῖν.*

Pliny *ep. ad Traianum* 96 (Lightfoot *S. Ignatius* i 50–53: the well-known letter about the Christians) 'seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent'.

Hermas *Mand.* iii 2 *οἱ οὖν ψευδόμενοι ἀθετοῦσι τὸν Κύριον, καὶ γίνονται ἀποστερηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, μὴ παραδίδοντες αὐτῷ τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἣν ἔλαβόν. ἔλαβον γὰρ πνεῦμα ἄψευστον· τοῦτο ἐὰν ψευδὲς ἀποδώσωσιν, ἐμίαναν τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἐγένοντο ἀποστερηταί.*

Id. *Mand.* viii 5 *καί γε πολλά, φησίν, ἔστιν ἀφ' ὧν δεῖ τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγκρατεύεσθαι· κλέμμα, ψεῦσμα, ἀποστέρησις, ψευδομαρτυρία, πλεονεξία κτλ.*

Id. *Sim.* vi 5. 5 *ὁ ὀξύχολος . . . καὶ ὁ μοιχὸς καὶ ὁ μέθυσος καὶ ὁ κατάλαλος καὶ ὁ ψεύστης καὶ ὁ πλεονέκτης καὶ ὁ ἀποστερητὴς καὶ ὁ τούτοις τὰ ὅμοια ποιῶν κτλ.*

Cyprian *ep.* lii 1 (Hartel 617. 1) 'Nicostratum quoque diaconio sanctae administrationis amisso, ecclesiasticis pecuniis sacrilega fraude subtractis et uiduarum ac pupillorum depositis denegatis . . .'

κεφαλιόω.

Mark xii 4 *καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κἀκεῖνον ἐκεφαλίωσαν καὶ ἠτίμασαν.*

Our authorities vary between *ἐκεφαλίωσαν* (ℵ B L Ψ) and *ἐκεφαλαίωσαν* (A C D Θ etc.): *κεφαλιόω* is not given in Liddell and Scott, *κεφαλαιόω* only—apart from this passage in Mark—in the sense 'to sum up'. The earliest Latin rendering is 'decollauerunt' *k*: but the injury implied must be something between the ἔδειραν of verse 3 and the ἀπέκτειναν of verse 5, and it must be on the same plane with ἠτίμασαν: in other words, it must be some sort of treatment which would degrade a man, or at any rate make him look ridiculous. I do not see that to 'knock on the head', even if we could get that sense out of the Greek word, which is all but impossible, satisfies this condition: and I see no alternative but conjectural emendation. Burkitt proposes ἐκολάφισαν: but how is 'slapped' a worse form of punishment than 'thrashed'? and why should a fairly familiar word have suffered so gross a corruption? Very tentatively I suggest, that a metathesis of the syllables κε and φα has taken place, such as might occur with an unfamiliar word, and that we should read ἐφακελίωσαν (or ἐφακέλωσαν), 'trussed him up in a bundle'. φάκελος is a classical word, and the verbal form φακελόω is quoted in L. S. from the Byzantine writer Nicetas. I notice too in Thumb that φακιόλι is modern Greek for a turban. If this were the true reading, the procedure indicated would be preparatory to some degrading process expressed by ἠτίμασαν.

προδοῦναι.

Mark xiv 10 ἵνα αὐτὸν προδοῖ (*or* προδοῖ αὐτὸν) αὐτοῖς is the reading of D *c i k* vulg (proderet), where the other texts have the verb elsewhere always used in the Gospels, παραδοῖ (traderet). In the next verse πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαίρως παραδοῖ stands without variant. I suspect that the Western reading in verse 10 is correct. The contrast between προδοῖ and παραδοῖ is very much to the point, προδοῦναι meaning 'to betray', παραδοῦναι properly to 'hand over', 'deliver up' to the chief priests. And it seems much more likely that the normal παραδοῦναι should be introduced by scribes and editors in place of the unusual word, than that the unusual word should have been, on this one occasion, introduced at all.

On the assumption then that προδοῖ is genuine, it will be, with Luke vi 16 Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριὼθ ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης, the only New Testament source of any usage of προδοῦναι προδότης, *prodere proditor*, in early Greek and Latin Christian literature. But while *proditor* is good Latin enough, there is no noun παραδότης in Greek, and therefore προδότης was inevitable (as well as προδοσία), but for the verb παραδοῦναι *tradere* is so all but universal in the Gospels in connexion with Judas that any evidence for the use of the alternative word in Christian antiquity seems worth collecting.

Martyrium Polycarpi vi 1, 2 ὁ εἰρήναρχος ὁ κεκληρωμένος τὸ αὐτὸ ὄνομα, Ἡρώδης ἐπιλεγόμενος, ἔσπευδεν εἰς τὸ στάδιον αὐτὸν εἰσαγαγεῖν· ἵνα ἐκεῖνος μὲν τὸν ἴδιον κλῆρον ἀπαρτίσῃ Χριστοῦ κοινωνὸς γενόμενος, οἱ δὲ προδόντες αὐτὸν τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰούδα ὑπόσχοιεν τιμωρίαν.

But this single example of προδοῦναι[1] refers primarily to the betrayal of Polycarp by a domestic rather than to the betrayal of Christ by Judas. One cannot therefore, on the evidence so far available, establish any influence of the solitary instance of προδοῦναι in St Mark, even if it is genuine, on Greek Christian usage.

The case for *prodere* in Latin is more respectable. It is of course clear that προδοῖ in Mark xiv 10, whether or no it is original, was the word rendered by the earliest Latin version: and the two writers now to be cited may or may not have derived their use of *prodere* from its use in this one instance in their Latin Gospels.

Cyprian *de eccl. unit.* 22 (Hartel, 229. 23) 'nam et Iudam inter apostolos Dominus elegit, et tamen Dominum Iudas postmodum prodidit [prodidit R M* prodit G tradidit W M^{2}]. non tamen idcirco apostolorum firmitas et fides cecidit quia proditor Iudas ab eorum societate defecit'.

Id. *ep.* lix 2 (668. 2) 'cum uideamus ipsum Dominum . . . ab eo quem inter apostolos ipse delegerat proditum'.

Ps.-Cypr. *ad Nouatianum* 14 (Hartel, iii 64. 20) 'Iudas ille inter apostolos electus . . . ipse postmodum deum prodidit'.

Proditor occurs also in Iren. lat. I xxviii 9 [xxxi 1] and II xxxii 3 [xx 5], but in the latter passage *traditor* two lines farther on: and in ps.-Tert. *adv. omn. haer.* 2. But as with προδότης this does not perhaps take us very far; though in Latin *traditor* was a possible (and presumably the usual) equivalent for 'the traitor'.

πυγμῇ.

vii 3 οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν. Beyond question πυγμῇ stands rightly in the text: so all Greek MSS except ℵ W: but the word was unfamiliar, as the varieties in rendering shew—the Sinai Syriac omits, while of the Latins *a* has momento, *b* subinde, *d* primo, *cffi* (more correctly) pugillo—and ℵ (followed, as so often, by Jerome in the Vulgate) W emend to πυκνά, crebro. But no one would have thought of altering a known word giving apparently (though not really) a suitable sense to anything as obscure as πυγμῇ. Now πυγμή means 'fist'; but it was also used as a measure of length 'from the fist to the elbow', and the Greek commentators Euthymius and Theophylact in fact interpret it here to mean thrusting the arm into the water up to the elbow (Swete). More than twenty years ago I called attention in this JOURNAL (vi 353), when reviewing Dom Butler's edition of the *Lausiac History* of Palladius, to the phrase in chapter lv, p. 148, l. 21, *νύψασθαι τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας πυγμῇ ὕδατι ψυχροτάτῳ*. A certain young deacon Jovinus was a member of a party travelling from Jerusalem to Egypt, and one very hot day on arriving at their destination he got a washing-tub and plunged hands and feet *πυγμῇ* into ice-cold water. Whereupon an elderly lady of the party rebuked him for self-indulgence in so pampering himself in his youth: she herself, though in the sixtieth year of her age, never washed anything *ἐκτὸς τῶν ἄκρων τῶν χειρῶν*. Since *χείρ* in Greek means properly the forearm, *τὰ ἄκρα τῶν χειρῶν* may mean 'the fingers' or even as much as 'the hands' in the modern sense of the word, but not more: and in contrast with this, Jovinus' washing must clearly have been 'up to the elbow'. That gives excellent sense also to the passage in Mark, and justifies the exegesis of Euthymius and Theophylact. We learn once more the value of the Greek Fathers, even the latest of them, as interpreters of the New Testament.

---

[1] I owe it to the kindness of Dr Darwell Stone, editor of the Lexicon of Patristic Greek.

(2)

ἀλλά (*Mark* 46 *times*, *Matthew* 37 *times*, *Luke* 36 *times*).

Obviously from these numbers the particle is a special favourite of Mark's: but obviously also there will be many instances where its use is normal, and offered no temptation to change. There are however some ten instances where Matthew does, apparently with intention, substitute another word, generally δέ: though as it happens in only three of these (3, 8, 9) have we a real parallel in Luke.

1. ix 8 *οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον*: so A C L W Δ Θ 565 sah. arm. Matt. xvii 8 *οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον*. In Mark ℵ B D have introduced *εἰ μή* from Matthew, but the Latins should not be quoted on this side, for they could hardly help rendering *ἀλλά* in this context by 'neminem nisi'—I suspect indeed that the *εἰ μή* of D may be due to assimilation to the 'nisi' of its Latin column. It is in the last degree unlikely that any scribe should have altered *εἰ μή* to the ungrammatical *ἀλλά*, while the converse change, supported by the parallel in Matthew, would be easy enough. Mark's usage is probably influenced by Aramaic, but Moulton-Milligan in their *Vocabulary of N.T.* cite from the papyri a close parallel *μὴ ἐξέστω Φιλίσκῳ γυναῖκα ἄλλην ἐπαγαγέσθαι ἀλλὰ Ἀπωλλωνίαν*.

2. ix 13 *ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν*. Matt. xvii 12 *λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν*.

3. xi 32 *ἀλλὰ εἴπωμεν Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων*; Matt. xxi 26, Luke xx 6, *ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων* . . .

4. xiii 20 οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς . . . Matt. xxiv 22 διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς . . .

5. xiii 24 ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην . . . Matt. xxiv 29 εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων . . .

6. xiv 28 ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Matt. xxvi 32 μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με . . .

7. xiv 29 εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ. Matt. xxvi 33 omits the ἀλλά, and writes εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι.

8. xiv 36 παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σύ. Matt. xxvi 39, Luke xxii 42, agree in substituting πλὴν for ἀλλά 1°, possibly to avoid the double ἀλλά of Mark.

9. xiv 49 ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί. The sentence is of course incomplete: Matt. xxvi 56 completes it by dropping ἀλλά and substituting τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν. Luke xxii 53 on the other hand retains ἀλλά but gives it a full construction, ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα . . .

10. xvi 7 ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ . . . Matthew once more drops ἀλλά, xxviii 7 καὶ ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε . . .

(πρὸς) ἑαυτούς.

(*Mark has* πρὸς ἑαυτούς *seven times,* πρὸς ἀλλήλους *four times*: *Luke* πρὸς ἑαυτούς *twice,* πρὸς ἀλλήλους *eight times*: *John* πρὸς ἑαυτούς *twice,* πρὸς ἀλλήλους *four times* : *Matthew never uses either phrase.*)

There is of course no doubt about the meaning of πρὸς ἀλλήλους (Mark iv 41, viii 16, ix 34, xv 31): the problem to be resolved is the meaning of πρὸς ἑαυτούς.

1. i 27 ὥστε συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας . . . I read πρὸς ἑαυτούς with A C D Θ W (αὐτούς 565) and Marcan usage, cf. 3 below: syr-sin 'to one another': αὐτούς ℵ B Tisch. W-H. I do not doubt that Alexandrian scholars disliked the phrase πρὸς ἑαυτούς if it was used—as συνζητεῖν shews it was here used—to mean 'with one another'. Luke's συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους shews that he had πρὸς ἑαυτούς, not αὐτούς, before him in Mark. There is no parallel in Matthew.

2. ix 10 καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτούς συνζητοῦντες τί ἐστιν . . . The parallel of 1 suggests that, in spite of the unusual order of the words, πρὸς ἑαυτούς must be taken with συνζητοῦντες, 'discussing with one another': for the absolute use of τὸν λόγον κρατεῖν 'keep in mind', cf. vii 3, 4, 8, 'observe the tradition'. There is no parallel in either Matthew or Luke.

3. x 26 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς . . . Once more the Alexandrians avoided πρὸς ἑαυτούς, substituting πρὸς αὐτόν: so

ℵ B C Δ Ψ and the Egyptian versions with W-H, against A D W latt. syr-sin and all other authorities with Tisch. But Mark's usage is quite decisive, for λέγειν πρὸς αὐτόν is never found in his Gospel, but always λέγειν αὐτῷ. Both Matthew and Luke have simply λέγοντες (εἶπαν).

4. xi 31 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες . . . Here Matthew alters to παρ' ἑαυτοῖς 'among themselves', and Luke, while retaining πρὸς ἑαυτούς, alters the verb to συνελογίσαντο, Luc. xx 5, compare xxii 23 συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτούς.

5. xii 7 ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν ὅτι . . . Again Matthew alters to εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς . . ., Luke to διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες . . . Luke, as in 1, clearly understood Mark to mean 'said to one another'.

6. xiv 4 ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς . . . Textual complications abound in this passage, and the usual conditions are reversed, for the Alexandrians and the mass of authorities with W syr-sin give πρὸς ἑαυτούς, while D Θ 565 *c ff i k* omit πρὸς ἑαυτούς with Matthew (there is no parallel in Luke): but again Marcan usage must be the decisive factor.

7. xvi 3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς Τίς ἀποκυλίσει . . . Neither Matthew nor Luke has anything parallel here.

Πρὸς ἑαυτούς 'with one another' is thus a Marcan usage, which Luke generally modifies, Matthew absolutely rejects. But Luke, wherever he is parallel to Mark, always retains the sense: it is a more difficult question whether Matthew, when he substitutes παρ' ἑαυτοῖς (4 above), or ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (5 above, and similarly for πρὸς ἀλλήλους of Mark viii 16), means the same thing as Mark or no, since ἐν ἑαυτοῖς might mean, what ἐν ἑαυτῷ must mean (Matt. ix 21, Mark v 30, Luke vii 39, xii 17, xvi 3, xviii 4), 'in their own hearts'.

ἐκ, ἀπό.

(*Mark has* ἐκ *half as often again as* ἀπό*; Matthew and Luke have* ἀπό *rather more frequently than* ἐκ*; John has* ἐκ *more than three times as often as* ἀπό*. The actual numbers for* ἐκ *are roughly Mark* 66, *Matthew* 82, *Luke* 87.)

On many occasions of course the other Synoptists take no offence at Mark's use of ἐκ: but some phrases they omit, and further in something over a dozen cases ἐκ of Mark is changed to ἀπό in one or both of them. Since ἐκ has given way to ἀπό in modern Greek, it does not seem likely that we can appeal to the κοινή to explain the preponderant use of ἐκ in Mark and John: and we seem thrown back on the Semitic atmosphere of the two Gospels.

1. i 10 *ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος*. Matthew *ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος*: no parallel in Luke.

2, 3. i 25, 26 *ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ* [*ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*] . . . *ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ*. Luke *ἔξελθε ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ . . . ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ*. The whole episode is absent from Matthew: but compare **9** below.

4. i 29 *καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες*. Luke *ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς*: no parallel in Matthew.

5. v 8 *ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ Ἔξελθε . . . ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. Luke *παρήγγελλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. Matthew abbreviates at this point and omits the whole verse.

6. vi 14 *ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν*. Luke retains *ἐκ*, doubtless because in the phrase 'rose again from the dead' *ἐκ νεκρῶν* was almost universal (so Luke, John, Acts, Pauline epistles, Hebrews, 1 Peter): Matthew is the only N.T. writer who even here prefers *ἀπό*, *ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν* xiv 2, cf. xxvii 64, xxviii 7 (xvii 9 *b* is the only exception).

7. ix 9 *a* *καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους*. So I read with B D 33 (and 'de monte' of latt. perhaps suggests *ἐκ* rather than *ἀπό*) W-H: if with the rest we read *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους* the explanation of the preposition may be that *ἐκ νεκρῶν* follows immediately after. Luke *κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους*: in Matt. xvii 9 *a* ℵ B C D W Θ and others agree with the *ἐκ* of Mark, and it is possible that the Lucan parallel is responsible for the intrusion of *ἀπό* into the majority of MSS of both Matthew and Mark. Of course *ἀπό* is the natural preposition to use with *καταβαίνειν*: so Matt. viii 1, xiv 29, xxvii 40, 42, Mark iii 22, xv 30, 32, Luke ix 54, x 30, Acts viii 26, xxv 7, 1 Thess. iv 6. The Gospel of John and the Apocalypse are alone in writing regularly *καταβαίνειν ἐκ*.

8. ix 17 *εἷς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου*. Matthew *ἄνθρωπος*: Luke *ἀνήρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου*.

9. ix 25 *ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ*. Matthew *ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ*: no parallel in Luke. Conversely the same phrase in **2, 3, 5,** is altered to *ἀπό* in Luke, while there is no parallel in Matthew.

10. xi 8 *στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν δένδρων*. Matthew *ἔκοπτον κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων*. Luke omits the clause.

11. xiii 1 *καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ*. Matthew *ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ*: the whole clause is dropped by Luke.

12. xiv 25 *οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου*. So in effect Matthew: but Luke *ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου*.

13. xvi 3 *τίς ἀπυκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου* Luke *εὗρον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου*. No parallel in Matthew.

πάλιν (*Mark* 27 *times*, *Matthew* 16 *times*, *Luke thrice*, *John* 43 *times*).

The mere enumeration of these numbers creates at once the suspicion that the preponderant use of the word in Mark and John, coupled with its practical absence from Luke, must be due *either* to the Aramaic background of the thought of the second and fourth evangelists, *or* to some characteristic of the Κοινή instinctively repugnant to the other two and especially to Luke. I do not propose here to choose between these two alternatives (they are not indeed mutually exclusive), but I confine myself to the investigation of the meaning or meanings of the word in Mark and of the procedure of the other two Synoptists when they found the word before them. But the caution must be given *in limine* that since Mark most commonly uses πάλιν in cases of transition—as we should put it, at the beginning of a paragraph—and since it is just these introductory phrases which Matthew and Luke habitually drop in copying Mark, the proportion of cases where there is no actual parallelism between the three is much smaller than the numbers at first sight suggest. In fact out of the twenty-seven instances in Mark, there are only nineteen where Matthew is strictly parallel, and for Luke only nine. Even so, the results are startling enough: Matthew retains πάλιν five times—twice with some modification—Luke retains it once.

Before giving the catalogue of the instances of πάλιν in Mark, it may be well to deal with, and dismiss, those cases where the textual evidence is divided for or against πάλιν. They are not many, and for the most part they reflect simply the same tendency, on the part of ancient scribes or editors, to dislike the word and therefore to remove it, which influenced Matthew and to a still greater degree Luke. But the textual problem is rather more complicated when it is a question of the place of πάλιν in the sentence, though it is probably a good general rule for Mark that in case of doubt the earlier place is the more likely to be genuine.

The most definite result that emerges is the bad record of the Textus Receptus: in vii 14 it substitutes πάντα τὸν ὄχλον for πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον, in viii 1 παμπόλλου ὄχλου for πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου; in xi 3 it omits πάλιν entirely, and, as represented by cod. A, also in x 24; while in viii 13 and xiv 40 it moves πάλιν to a later position in the sentence. But again the record of the Western text is not wholly satisfactory, though it must of course not be forgotten, so far as the Latin witnesses are concerned, that either omission or transposition of so apparently unimportant a word may take place in the process of rendering into the vernacular, whatever was the form of the Greek before the translator: for omission compare ii 13 (D^{gr}, *fam* 13?), viii 13 (*b c*), x 1 (W *fam* 13 *b c ff i*), xi 3 (W 565 syr. sin. latt.), xiv 40 (D W *a c ff k*), for transposition iv 1 ἤρξατο πάλιν and v 21 εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν (D 565 O.L., with the support on the second occasion of ℵ and on the first of W). On the other hand in ii 1 πάλιν εἰσῆλθεν of latt. (W) is a transposition in the right direction, and in xiv 69 πάλιν ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἡ παιδίσκη of D Θ 565 *c k* syr. sin. I believe to be right against the rest. The solitary instance of a serious discrepancy in text is xiv 40, where πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὗρεν αὐτούς of ℵ B L (so syr-sin, but with πάλιν after αὐτούς, and D and O.L., but without πάλιν) must unquestionably be right against the ὑποστρέψας of W Θ 565 vulg. and the mass of Greek authorities, since ὑποστρέφω, while common in Luke and Acts, is never found (apart from this passage) in Matthew, Mark, or John: it is just an attempt to vary the construction of xiv 40 from that of xiv 39.

1. ii 1 καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναούμ . . . 'Again', with reference back to i 39 καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Matthew omits πάλιν: Luke is not parallel.

2. ii 13 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. 'And he left Capernaum again for the lake-side', with reference to ii 1. Πάλιν omitted by Luke: Matthew not parallel.

3. iii 1 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς συναγωγήν. Πάλιν omitted by both the others: in Mark are we to interpret 'again', 'once more', with possibly a reference to i 21, 39? or if that is too distant, are we forced to render πάλιν by something like 'next'?

4. iii 20 καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν [ὁ] ὄχλος. 'And again a [the] crowd collects': we can quite easily refer back, if need be, to iii 9 διὰ τὸν ὄχλον. No parallels in the other Synoptists.

5. iv 1 καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. The lake-side had been mentioned in iii 7, and teaching by the lake-side in ii 13. But with each recurrence of πάλιν the impression seems to become clearer that Mark has not really got these elaborate cross-references in his mind, the more so that πάλιν, as the story proceeds, comes more frequently at the beginning of the sentence, and so corresponds more closely to our English use of 'Again' in the same position. Omitted by Matthew: no parallel in Luke.

6. v 21 καὶ διαπεράσαντος . . . πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν. Here the idiomatic rendering would certainly be 'back to the other side': and viii 13, x 10, x 32, xi 3, xi 27, xiv 39, 40, are also cases, where with verbs of motion, the same word 'back' may not be the right one. It appears to be the only meaning of πάλιν in Homer. Luke omits: no parallel in Matthew.

7. vii 14 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον. 'And summoning the

crowd again.' The right rule for securing the equivalent sense in English seems to be to put 'again' into the most inconspicuous place. 'Once more' is certainly reading too much into Mark. Matthew omits: Luke is deficient as far as 11 inclusive.

8. vii 31 *καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν*. Omitted by Matthew. Conceivably we should render 'and on the return, leaving the district of Tyre, he came'.

9. viii 1 *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος*. It is here more attractive to see a definite intention to hark back to the other miracle of feeding, vi 34 *εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον*, and if so we must render 'there was again a great crowd', in the sense of 'once more'. Matthew has just mentioned 'crowds' twice over as present, and so omits the whole verse.

10. viii 13 *καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν*. Here again, comparing verse 10 *ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον*, we must apparently render 'embarked again and went away to the other side'. Matthew again omits the word.

11. viii 25 *εἶτα πάλιν [ἐπ]έθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ*. *Πάλιν* obviously here refers back to the first imposition of hands in verse 23, 'again' in the sense of a second time, cf. xiv 39, 40, 69, 70. The whole story is absent from Matthew.

12, 13. x 1 *συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος* (for the reading see on [*συν*]*πορεύεσθαι* below) *πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς*. It is worth noting that the combination of 'crowd' and 'teaching' does occur before in vi 34; but the interval is so great that we can hardly suppose a direct reference, and must fall back on the indefinite 'again'. In neither clause does *πάλιν* reappear in Matthew: there is no parallel in Luke.

14. x 10 *καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν*. It is very tempting to render 'and when they were back in the house his disciples asked him about it': see **6** above. Again no parallel in Luke: omission of the whole verse in Matthew.

15. x 24 *ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει*. Here the reference to verse 23 seems clear, 'but Jesus repeated his statement', 'said once more'. Luke omits the verse, no doubt because it is a repetition: Matthew, to avoid any break in our Lord's words, ingeniously alters to *πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν*.

16. x 32 *καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα*, 'taking the twelve back into company with him', because He had been walking on alone in front. See again **6** above.

17. xi 3 *καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει αὐτὸν πάλιν ὧδε*. If (as I think) these words are part of the message the two disciples were to deliver, we could render 'The Lord needs the colt, and will send back again here

(i. e. to the place from which it was taken) as soon as ever he has done with him'. The clause is omitted by Luke, the word by Matthew.

18. xi 27 *καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.* Comparing verse 19 'they left the city', I should once more render 'they come back to Jerusalem'. Both the other evangelists omit the whole sentence.

19. xii 4 *καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον.* The reference is to the first sending of a servant in verse 2, 'and again he sent them a second servant'. Matthew retains *πάλιν*, Luke retains the idea but avoids the word by *προσέθετο πέμψαι.*

20, 21. xiv 39, 40 (*καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν . . . καὶ ἔρχεται . . .*) *καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν . . . καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν . . .* It seems impossible here not to translate 'he went forward [*v.* 35] . . . and he came and found them asleep [*v.* 37] . . . and a second time he went away [*v.* 39] . . . and a second time he came and found them asleep [*v.* 40] . . . [Mark leaves us to understand the third departure, which Matthew supplies, xxvi 44 *καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀπελθών*] . . . and he came the third time and said unto them'. *πάλιν . . . τὸ τρίτον* correspond, that is, to one another: Matthew makes this still clearer by writing *πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου . . . ἐκ τρίτου.* But Mark is content with the less emphatic *πάλιν*: it is only when the second time is important as such that he writes in xiv 72 *εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.* Luke has no parallel: Matthew to the double use of *πάλιν* in Mark adds a third of his own.

22. xiv 61 *καὶ πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν*: referring to a previous *ἐπηρώτησεν* of *v.* 60, cf. **26.** Matthew omits: Luke is not parallel.

23, 24, 25. xiv 69, 70 [*ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδισκῶν . . . καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον . . . λέγει . . . ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο λέγων . . .*] *πάλιν ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἡ παιδίσκη. ἤρξατο λέγειν . . . ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνεῖτο. καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον . . .* Here we have, as in **21, 22,** *πάλιν* for the second assertion and the second denial, but, in contrast to that passage, also of the third assertion. Of the three cases of *πάλιν* Luke retains none, Matthew only the second.

26. xv 4 *ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν*, referring to *v.* 2 *καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πειλᾶτος.* 'Questioned him again', exactly as in **22.** No parallel in Luke: Matthew substitutes his favourite *τότε.*

27. xv 12 *ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*, referring back (as in **22** and **26**) to a previous contact of the same interlocutors, *v.* 9 *ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων.*

28. xv 13 *οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἔκραξαν Σταύρωσον αὐτόν.* A difficulty is raised (see Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v.) by Souter, on the ground presumably that the crowd had not been said to have made the cry before. But it must be remembered that in the case of the high priest, and both times in the case of Pilate—**22, 26, 27**—Mark's *πάλιν* does not imply that the same question or statement was repeated, but only that 'he questioned him again' or 'he made answer to them again'. And we may well suppose that possibly *v.* 8 and more certainly *v.* 11 implies a previous ἔκραξαν on the part of the crowd. Luke at least so interpreted the words of *v.* 11 ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς, for he writes in xxiii 18 ἀνέκραγον δὲ πανπληθεὶ λέγοντες· Αἶρε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν Βαραββᾶν.

What are the general results of this perhaps over long and over detailed enquiry? Primarily, I think, that πάλιν is in Mark a very light and unemphatic particle: and secondly that the original sense of 'back' seems clear in certain connexions, e.g. 6, 17, and possible in 8, 14, 16, 18. The vehement dislike of Luke for the word I should suppose to be due exactly to his Hellenic sense of the importance of definiteness and precision in the use of particles. In the first five instances of the list just given πάλιν is really almost otiose as used by Mark.

ὑπάγω and πορεύεσθαι (with its compounds).

A. ὑπάγω.

(*Mark* 15 *times*, *Matthew* 19 *times*, *Luke* 5 *times*, *John* 32 *times*, *Apocalypse* 6 *times: not in Acts*, *Paul*, *or Hebrews*.)

The first distinction that needs drawing about ὑπάγω is between its use in the imperative and its use in other moods: for while Matthew (17 times out of 19) and Mark (12 times out of 15) use it almost exclusively in the imperative, this was exactly what Luke most disliked. The imperative is found only twice in Luke, four times in John, and twice in the Apocalypse.

Imperative.

1. i 44 ὕπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ. So Matthew: Luke ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον . . .

[ii 9 καὶ ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὕπαγε ℵ L Δ Tisch (and with the addition εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου D 33 *a ff* arm.: this is perhaps the earlier form of the corruption) is certainly wrong, and has come in from *v.* 11. περιπάτει must be read with A B C W Θ 565 *b c e* vulg. sah.: and so Matthew and Luke.]

2. ii 11 καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. So Matthew: Luke πορεύου . . .
3. v 19 Ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. Absent from Matthew: Luke ὑπόστρεφε . . .
4. v 34 Ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην. Again no parallel in Matthew: πορεύου Luke.
5. vi 38 Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε ἴδετε. Matthew drops the verse: Luke recasts, using πορευθέντες.
6. vii 29 Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὕπαγε. Matthew recasts: Luke is defective.
7. viii 33 Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ. So Matthew: Luke omits the episode.

8. x 21 Ὕπαγε ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον. Matthew retains ὕπαγε, Luke omits it.

9. x 52 Ὕπαγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. Luke changes ὕπαγε to ἀνάβλεψον, Matthew omits the whole clause.

10. xi 2 Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν. Here the usual conditions are reversed, for Matthew changes to πορεύεσθε, Luke on this one occasion retains ὑπάγετε.

11. xiv 13 Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν. So Matthew: Luke εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς . . .

12. xvi 7 ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε, εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. Matthew substitutes πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε, Luke omits the charge to deliver a message, probably because of the reference to Galilee.

Other moods (*participle and indicative*).

13. vi 31 ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοί. Not in Matthew or Luke.

14. vi 33 καὶ εἶδαν αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας. Again not in either Matthew or Luke.

15. xiv 21 ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει. So Matthew: Luke πορεύεται.

On the whole then Matthew retains Mark's imperatives 5/7, but substitutes πορεύεσθε (πορευθεῖσαι) 2/7: in the other moods he retains ὑπάγειν only once, xiv 21 = Matt. xxvi 24. Luke never retains any form of the verb where he finds it in Mark, save only xi 2 = Luke xix 30: four times he substitutes πορεύεσθαι, once ὑποστρέφειν, and twice uses the participles ἀπελθών, εἰσελθόντων. It seems not unusual with Luke to deal more drastically than in the rest of his Gospel with a word which he finds often, and dislikes, in Mark.

ὑπάγειν must have been a κοινή use, and appears to survive in modern Greek (Blass *Grammatik des N.T. Griechisch* § 24 s.v.). The use probably had its origin in the want of a word to express 'go' as contrasted with 'come' (Mark vi 31 οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες is exactly our 'coming and going'), and for this purpose it is more expressive than the alternative πορεύεσθαι. Further it seems not unlikely that the colloquial imperative ὕπαγε 'go' is an echo of the similar, quite classical, ἄγε 'come': though it is not clear why the particular compound ὕπαγε was employed for the purpose.

B. πορεύεσθαι and its compounds.

πορεύεσθαι (Matthew 28 times, Luke 50 times: never in Mark).

[Mc. ix 30 κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες ἐπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας B D *c* W-H text. παρεπορεύοντο the rest, and Marcan usage—see below on παραπορεύεσθαι—is decisive in favour of this reading. 'Iter faciebant' of *a* should not be cited (as by Tischendorf) on the side of the simple verb: it would be an excellent rendering of παραπορεύεσθαι.]

In Luke πορεύεσθαι is three times substituted for ἀπελθεῖν of Mark, four times for ὑπάγειν of Mark.

διαπορεύεσθαι (Luke thrice: not Matthew or Mark at all).

[Mc. ii 23 καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν διαπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων B C D W-H text: πορεύεσθαι W: παραπορεύεσθαι the rest, according to Marcan usage. διαπορεύεσθαι has clearly come in from Luke.]

ἐκπορεύεσθαι (Mark eleven times, Matthew four times [Mt. xvii 21 is not genuine], Luke three times).

Matthew twice substitutes the simple verb, twice ἐξέρχεσθαι, once ἐκβάλλεσθαι. Luke generally omits. Note that Mark three times uses the word in the genitive absolute of the present participle, ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ, of our Lord's movements: x 17, x 46, xiii 1.

παραπορεύεσθαι (Mark four times, Matthew once, copying Mc. xv 29, Luke never).

Apparently the compound verb παραπορεύεσθαι must have been unfamiliar or unpalatable, for, as we have seen, B D agree in altering it on two of the four occasions (ii 23, ix 30) when Mark uses it. παράγειν too is never used by Luke.

προσπορεύεσθαι (not in Matthew or Luke).

Mc. x 35 καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης.

This compound is found in the LXX, but nowhere else in N.T.

συνπορεύεσθαι (Luke three times: not in Matthew).

[Mc. x 1 καὶ συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν ℵ B and the mass of Greek MSS, followed by Tischendorf and W-H. Marcan usage shews conclusively that ὄχλος is right against ὄχλοι, and I have no doubt that συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος should be read with D 565 syr. sin. *a b c ff i k* (*conuenit turba*). The other reading has come in from Luke xiv 25 συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί.]

The investigation leads to queer results as between the Gospels. The simple verb is common in Matthew, very common in Luke, but never occurs in Mark. Of the compounds Mark uses ἐκπορεύεσθαι rather often, and is not averse to παραπορεύεσθαι: but both are rarely or never found in the other two Synoptists. Luke on the other hand uses two compounds, διαπορεύεσθαι and συνπορεύεσθαι, which are never found in Matthew or Mark. Perhaps more curious still is the effort which scribes of Mark, and especially we may say the Alexandrian editor whose work is represented in B, have made to get rid of παραπορεύεσθαι and to introduce the forms preferred by Luke (in ii 23 διαπορεύεσθαι, in ix 30 πορεύεσθαι, cf. x 1 συνπορεύεσθαι): some similar instinct of Hellenic taste must, it would seem, have prompted both the evangelist and the Alexandrian scholar.

C. H. Turner.

REVIEWS

Adventure: The Faith of Science and the Science of Faith, by BURNETT H. STREETER, CATHERINE M. CHILCOTT, JOHN MACMURRAY, and ALEXANDER S. RUSSELL. (Macmillan & Co., London, 1927.)

THE book contains six essays. Of the 243 pages two by Canon Streeter take up 130, and the first, 'Moral Adventure', gives the keynote of the whole. This is also the most brilliantly, perhaps too brilliantly, written. But the whole book has verve, and all of it is interesting and pleasant reading. Moreover, it is healthy, vigorous, full of right feeling and good sense, and of a temper fitted to commend it to the younger generation, and much needed to brace up the older.

Only when we begin to ask, in a cold-blooded way, whether the thinking is as sound as its presentation is persuasive, do doubts begin to creep in.

The first paper, 'The Dynamic of Science', is by Dr Alexander Smith Russell of Christ Church, University Lecturer in Inorganic Chemistry. The drift of it is that 'science at the present moment is getting away from the intellectual pharisaism of recent years and becoming adventurous: and it is finding it good to be adventurous' The emancipation of science from Newtonian orthodoxy might be so described. But the important point is what Mr Whitehead maintains, that science must not only start from experience as we find it, but return to experience as we find it, not to schoolmaster it, but to learn anew the limitation of its explanations. If it thinks, with Dr Russell, that the atoms and electrons tell us all that is important about metals, it is only in for another spell of another orthodoxy. Still the lesson is, or ought to be, what Dr Russell makes it—such humility before all reality as is courage before all authority.

The second paper, 'Beyond Knowledge', is by Mr Macmurray of Balliol. The subject is really the nature of faith. Why it is called 'Beyond Knowledge' is not very plain, because the view of faith is not very different from what is set forth by William James in *The Will to Believe*. It is not, we are told, a kind of knowledge, nor is it a way of knowing. It is an attitude of the will. Faith in the New Testament is not believing something, but 'a general readiness to trust, an absence of hesitation and of the reckoning of consequences'. It is absence of 'the fear of danger in a universe which is the Father's house'. But is that merely a resolve not to see ghosts: or is it a kind of knowledge of what the universe is like? Is faith merely venture?

Is it not the assurance, upon which we venture? In the New Testament is not 'we know' often a synonym for 'we believe'?

'We walk by faith not by sight' surely presupposes a knowledge, of some kind, of the unseen which is eternal, which we can oppose to the seen which is temporal? 'We know in whom we have believed' is the spring of the acting. Faith is not a way of acting upon no knowledge or understanding. Whatever 'Lest they should understand' may mean, it cannot mean that the parables were not intended to evoke very definite convictions.

Again, 'Faith is the principle of life in any body of growing knowledge which appeals to practical activity for its vindication; which "tries all theories and holds fast that which is good"'. But does it work on no knowledge? It works, we are told, with the demand for truth and right, the distant vision of the kingdom of God. Is that not knowledge? Besides the power of faith in the New Testament is that the kingdom of God is among us in potentiality, and we can now live in it.

The broad contention is right, that faith is power to face reality, and that a fear of enquiry like Newman's is unfaith: and the ability with which this is presented gives great value to the paper. But it goes wrong largely through a mistaken view of intuition as primitive and a result of habit. There is no task so high, so difficult, so dependent on all we are, as well as all we know, as just to see. What makes Jesus a supreme authority in faith is that He never appealed to anything else. So far is it from being independent of practice, that only in a right relation of our whole attitude to anything can we see; and so far is it from being outside of reasoning, that if we are not reasoning about our intuitions and trying to help each other to see better, reasoning is mere barren dialectic. Faith does somehow reach what is beyond knowledge, because for a faith we may be able not to fear them that kill the body, but not for a mere knowledge, unless loyalty to it also becomes a matter of faith. The faith of Christianity was that, in the world as well as beyond it, there is a purpose for which all things work together for good. Thereby, enquiry, doubt, everything could be faced. How does this come? Surely not merely by an attitude of the will. The will depends on it and not the other way. Faith is not venture, but we venture on faith. The New Testament speaks of faith, not courage or adventure, for this very reason.

With this we may take Mr Macmurray's other essay 'Objectivity in Religion', which is fifth in the series. Just as Mr Macmurray is right about faith and courage to enquire, so he is right in this essay in thinking that the reality or unreality of religion depends on the real existence of its object.

The essay begins with a just and penetrating criticism of the imperfect idea of the individual, both in Scientific Naturalism and in Critical Idealism. But is this remedied by the exclusive stress he lays on self-transcendence? Does he thereby get beyond the conception of Romanticism, which we may call Individuality? By insisting on the idea of responsibility, he shews that he does not ignore the other problem, which we may call the problem of the individual. But he fails to put on it the right emphasis. How is it that the individual as such, without further merit, is of supreme worth? How is it that nothing is true except as he sees it, or right except as he decides it? This is important, not only for personality, but for the universe which has room for it and the values by which we know its nature. In some way man, as this makes him possible, must be, in thought and action, the measure of the universe. Nor is it easy to see how even an incarnation could alter that, as we should still need to be judges of it as we find human worth in it.

The claim of the essay is that only an incarnation can give objectivity to the belief in God. 'The sublimest prophetic conception of the character of God', we are told, 'is but an art-product of human phantasy, created to meet the need of human souls in the stress of their labour and anguish, born of the Will-to-Believe.'

To begin with, this is not fair to James's *Will to Believe*, which is much nearer the author's own idea of faith. But did Jesus ever profess to make men believe in God? Did He think thus of the prophetic faith? 'Ye believe in God', He is reported as saying, 'believe also in me.' Apparently a belief in God was necessary for the latter. 'He that is taught of God cometh unto me.' He shews God as Father, but it is an addition to a real faith already existing. If the prophets could conceive man's spirit as so great that no calamity could be so terrible as not to be worth the price of its deliverance and progress, and in this faith passed, in calmness and possession of their souls, through calamities which drove all others to paralysing terror and despair, did they not make one of the supremest experiments respecting the nature of objective reality? Nor does their account of it mean that they thought the message of God to them external. Nor was a God who rose up early to send them, working all day as it were at his people's deliverance, and who would write his law on their hearts, so distant a transcendent being as Mr Macmurray describes. Nor does their sense of sinfulness make them incapable of knowing God. On the contrary it came from knowing Him. 'I am a man of unclean lips, for mine eyes have seen the king, the Lord of Hosts.' Nor is it plain what is meant by the prophets failing because they transferred their hope to the future. Mr Macmurray surely does not imagine that this is absent from the teaching of Jesus. Was it not precisely as representing the humanity which is the divine nature of this rule—one like unto a son of man, and its method of sacrifice and service—like a lamb slain, that His earliest followers, at least, conceived His mission ; possibly that He conceived it Himself?

Are not all religions distinguished from mere speculations by being experiments in living in some aspect of unseen reality? Even pantheism has a truth. That it is at once a partial truth and a wrong relation to it does not call this in question. Even on the reality of the outward world we do not cast doubt by misusing it. To question this is to make even an incarnation not a means of personal experience to God, but a mere source of authoritative information regarding Him. Jesus revealing the Father, because He shews us our relation to God and enables us so to enter into it that we see God for ourselves? His final word is not 'I say', but 'You see'.

In the main this is what Canon Streeter lays stress on in his essay on 'Finality in Religion', and it is more central at least than Mr Macmurray's appeal to the *gesta Christi*. For one thing people believed in Christ and found thereby their world a new creation before there was ever any such evidence. Mr Macmurray's description is a fine piece of work, and it has its right place, but is it the place he gives it? In one sense no doubt Jesus is universal, but He also, as man, had His own vocation, which is to be judged purely by His religious task of perfect sonship, revealing the Father and manifesting the power of His kingdom.

But though these criticisms rather go to the roots of Mr Macmurray's thinking, I wish to acknowledge very warmly the ability, the sincerity, and, above all, the profoundly religious spirit of Mr Macmurray's papers.

A consideration of Miss Chilcott's paper on 'Myth and Reality' naturally follows Mr Macmurray's, as the essay does in the book.

Possibly owing to some constitutional inability, this is the paper I find most difficult both in understanding and in judging. There seems to be some kinship with Hegel's view of religion as picture philosophy. Religion interprets reality by myth, and Christianity claims for its myth truth of objective fact. But how far the writer regards this claim as well-founded is not clear, and, if it is not, is it myth or legend?

Apparently the paper is an attempt to justify the doctrines based on the Gospel story, but it is not clear whether this is defended as right interpretation, or as an embodiment of religious ideas for which the Gospel is mere starting-point. In short, is it Catholic orthodoxy or Modernist comprehensiveness? For example, we have the idea of a mediator, that, first, he approaches God in the name of His worshippers and presents their needs, and, second, he interprets to them the divine will. It is doubtful if even the latter is as Jesus conceived His mission; and, as to the former, if He did anything, it was to shew that such a conception of God was pure misunderstanding. In Christianity, we are told, we see the same sense of the gulf between the perfection of God and the sinfulness of man as in Paganism with its welter of daimons, half-human, half-divine, in between. But surely not in Christ's Christianity? The historical necessity of such an interpretation to meet this situation we can see. But does not our first task continue to be the recovery of Christ's own conception of God: and, through that, of what ought to be our own? Has theology a right to be content either with myth or legend? What is the meaning then of saying that 'for their fruition we must look not merely to the Son of Mary of Nazareth, but to the whole of humanity whom He represents and consummates'. This is Hegel and his representatives' the Modernists. But does not humanity here quite frequently mean, 'for the hardness of men's hearts Moses gave this commandment', not, 'I say unto you'? Neither by myth, nor by legend, nor even by history can we evade the task of facing up to any doctrine just as truth. What we can ask is, that doctrines by which men have lived by faith should be treated with reverence, and the truth in them by which men lived not thrown away with what is erroneous and outlived. And in this task, as was said a century ago, Christianity has the supreme advantage over all other religions, that, by Christ and the Gospel, every man is equipped for the task of distinguishing the gold from the alloy time mixes with it, so that Christianity has a power of rejuvenescence not possessed in any degree by any other religion.

Canon Streeter's contribution, though longer than the rest and certainly not less important, requires less discussion, because a large part of it deals with practical ethics, about which the chief thing to be said is that it is full of the wisdom of experience and understanding—if not of men, at least of the kind of educated person he is addressing—sagacious, almost too sagacious, and balanced, almost too balanced.

The first essay is entitled 'Moral Adventure'.

It starts off with a whole constellation of dazzling historical antitheses, rather too neat and polished for any of them to be quite true. If we read Butler it will be plain that it was not left for Darwin to disestablish the fashionableness of Church doctrines. In spite of being entirely ignored in this book, the Illumination determined the situation it deals with more than all the movements it does mention put together. Again, was the medieval idea of the flames of hell derived from Jewish Apocalyptic? Where it came from may be doubtful, but in its medieval form its beginning was surely much later than any dealing with Jewish Apocalyptic. And was it ever an idea merely of terror? Was it not rather a material form of trying to conceive the absolute difference of good and evil? May that not have been why it obsessed minds like Dante's and Milton's? Perhaps also we do not ever rightly rid ourselves of it till we have established that difference on sound spiritual grounds. Something of the failure to do this rather marks a weakness in Canon Streeter's ethic. What is it, even if the verdict of our own conscience be in need of constant revision, which makes choosing what it discerns to excel, not a matter of prudence, but of absolute sacredness?

But to proceed with the antitheses. How far is it true to say that 'Morally the Renaissance was not pagan, it was merely purposeless'? With what limitations was Benvenuto Cellini its type? Was Horace's epicureanism a protest against too high seriousness? Was it not rather itself a serious plea for living one's life simply and without greed or ostentation? Was the Reformation a world-denying movement? Had it no idea of the common life as the religious life? Had it no concern with a better society? Wyclif surely had some notions of the kind; and it began with him. If Luther had his apocalyptic moments of world conflagration, he never ceased to fight for a better world, and he thought the shoemaker properly shoeing the pope was as religious as the pope praying for the shoemaker. And all this leaves out Calvinism with its call to live to the glory of God which made it the most revolutionary political force the world has ever seen. Nor was the fear of hell ever the foundation of Protestantism as seems to be affirmed. What did the ninety-five theses do except deny it? Pardon they say is concerned with sin itself, not sin's consequences.

But we must not make too much of these peccadilloes. For in what follows the advice given is so wise, gracious, and helpful that criticism seems rather a desecration. Yet sometimes it almost appears as if there was something after all in some old taboos, and that even the most enlightened morality, if it is to be robust, needs to recover its absoluteness of regard. Also a feeling is stirred at times that a true morality of positive adventure, always choosing the things that excel, would not be troubled with some of the casuistry. But this may be an inherent weakness of moral advice, and possibly also Canon Streeter knows his audience too well to insist very much on an ultimate sanction or a measureless goal, or on what we might call the apocalyptic nature of Christian morality, the nature of it as a way of living as though the kingdom of Heaven were already come.

The other article, 'Finality in Religion', deals with an extremely difficult subject: and anything to be said of its shortcomings is largely discounted by the fact that I know of nothing in any language which deals with it better. There is the historical difficulty. The flux of experience and the finality of any ideal seem to be irreconcileable. There is also the religious one. Were the goal of history attained, the meaning Christianity gives it, as having an eternal purpose of God both in it and beyond it, would cease to apply. Also the liberty of the children of God, as well as the liberty of the enquiring spirit, forbids us to live under the authority of the past. Yet in practice it is impossible to come in touch with the spirit of Christ at all without realizing something absolute, something which is precisely the rock on which we can stand in the flux of things and have the spiritual outlook which has a right to judge all things and be judged of no man. To attempt to sum up in a phrase all that Canon Streeter says on the subject would manifestly involve grave omission and possibly distortion, but one part at least of his contention may be summed up by saying that Jesus is so perfectly the Son that we have in him an absoluteness of relation to the Father from which progress can alone be made securely in the knowledge and service of God and his purpose in man, an absoluteness which only becomes more certain the more it is built on. If I have any criticism, it is that this is not made central enough. Because this sonship was the perfect realization of the Father, there is a sense in which we cannot go beyond Christ's revelation of God. But there is a sense also in which, being sons, we increase in the knowledge of God of our own experience and insight and cannot accept the knowledge, if not of God, of God's mind for us even from Christ. Canon Streeter's other suggestions are less convincing and occasionally require management, and sometimes the argument only concerns modern fashions of thinking. To deal with them is necessary; but one is apt to come down in doing so, from the mount of vision. In the main, however, the essay even if it does not successfully accomplish what the writer sets out to do, at least gives help greatly wanted.

The Christian Experience of Forgiveness, by H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.Phil., D.D., Professor of Theology, New College, Edinburgh. (Nisbet & Co., Ltd., London, 1927.)

THIS is a theological treatise in the fullest sense of the word, a work of solid learning, painstaking thought, systematic exposition, and carefully pondered style. It may be laboured but is always sustained, and if it errs, it is in eloquence, not in expansiveness. In these days when men can write a discussion on any conceivable problem *currente calamo*, and in the lucidest 'newspaperese', the almost too painstaking form of the work is a grateful reminder of more quiet and patient days, before men had had the pace set for them by the motor-car. It deals with the wide scope of the history of the question, with the central theologies of it, with its ethical and its religious aspects, its personal and its social. And this is only preliminary to the main task of shewing that it is central to all understanding of the peace and power of Jesus Christ and in the understanding of all Christianity. Finally it relates the doctrine to the whole fullness of the Christian life and service and shews what it signifies for the Church and the Church for it.

In most ways the work is worthy of the learning of the writer and the labour which has been spent on it. No one can read it without being impressed by its somewhat austere religious spirit and without being stirred to a deep sense of what is at stake. There is the wealth of varied standpoints, which comes from not dealing with a theory but with a whole world of reality. There are many thoughts which will bear reflexion and expansion. For the preacher especially it is a challenge to be central in his preaching and a manifestation of the riches at his disposal if he will be, which ought to help him in following the apostles as a minister of reconciliation.

This kind of work naturally has the defects of its quality, though, so rare is the quality in these days, that it seems almost ungrateful to mention them, and many readers, perhaps most, will think them excellences, not defects. Moreover, disagreement is probably rather from a difference of race and temperament and general outlook than from any clear difference of opinion. The book has in a very high degree the quality of unction. No utterance is really religious if devoid of it. Yet there is here something of a Celtic quality with which the ordinary Briton feels a little overwhelmed. With this goes a difference of feeling, which is very difficult to describe, but which suffuses the whole outlook upon life.

Thus Prof. Mackintosh naturally takes to Otto's awed holy; the other type instinctively shakes it off as a nightmare. Prof. Mackintosh revels in dogmatic forms, and in filling with his own meaning the ritual of phrases hallowed by orthodox use; the other suspects himself of unreality the moment he starts using them. Especially with a doctrine like forgiveness, any departure from simple statements seems a hazardous elaboration.

Nor are the difficulties the two types of mind feel the same. Prof. Mackintosh very easily thinks of God as just doing things; it is an essential part of the latter's idea of God that God is just another name for the ultimate real. Thus the problem of forgiveness is apt to be, for him, something exceptional that God does, while, for the other type it is something which is just because God is what He is, and we have found it out.

This latter view makes only one condition of forgiveness, but it is a very comprehensive one, for it is just God. When the prodigal returns home he accepts what he had rejected, and his home-coming is his forgiveness, and his remaining there the abiding in its security and succour. All this Prof. Mackintosh has, and he says too that we must not divide when we distinguish. But, somehow, so simple a human everyday sort of business does not move happily in such heavy theological brocade. Yet it is a sort of essential ritual for those whom Prof. Mackintosh represents, without which religion would hardly be recognizable. Hence the importance of the phraseology of the older evangelicalism, even when, like 'atonement' and 'substitution', it is on other ideas than theirs. The work is very ably done; it does not surrender the author's position, and it gives a place to important truths. But, for all that, it a little suggests David in Saul's armour with his sling-arm not quite free to those whose ritual is different.

With the main line of thought there will be general agreement. But is the real difficulty in forgiveness either God's holiness, except in so far as it means that man is not having it, or the need of pardoning without corrupting? Do not both difficulties arise from confusing pardoning with condoning? This important distinction Prof. Mackintosh usually regards, but occasionally his argument depends on stepping from one into the other. As the essence of sin is hypocrisy, is not the essence of forgiveness such awakening of our trust in God's deliverance that we are no longer tempted to seek this refuge from Him? Anyhow, in the New Testament the difficulty to be overcome is all in us. Then from 'the law of a spirit made alive in Christ' the rest follows as everything does genuine conviction. From this Prof. Mackintosh does not really differ, yet in God commending His love, he hankers after something God has a great deal of difficulty in getting over. Now it makes all the difference whether Christ's death embodies this, or is the victory over the evil of the world which brings near to us the true nature of a pardoning and succouring God. Besides is not suffering too prominent and the victory of the Cross too little? The dying in weakness is to live in power. But whether this be the cause or not, somehow we do not reach the uplift of the New Testament, with the joy of the Lord our strength, and all things a new creation to work for our good.

At the same time Prof. Mackintosh's grave, serious, and even awed exposition may be of more value in our jaunty time, even because of this, which otherwise might be a limitation. He deals with the gravest matter in life gravely. He shews none of the cheapness of our sloppy hymns such as, 'nowhere is more kindly judgement given than up in heaven', and the 'heart of the eternal is most wonderfully kind', without a shadow of a hint that God is just reality and what He thinks is just what is, and what is has great need to be altered, and that the great problem is that nothing of it can be altered to profit except by God, and that even He can only alter it, by our own insight and consecration, to serve Him in the spirit and become His children. Whatever this book may fail to do, it does not fail to shew that this is central, decisive, all-important, a business of dealing with essential divine and human reality, without either sentimental unreality or legal fiction.

Systematic Theology, by WILHELM HERRMANN, translated by NATHANIEL MICKLEM and KENNETH SAUNDERS. (George Nelson & Unwin, Ltd., London, 1927.)

THIS volume consists of the notes for his course of lectures on Dogmatics made by Prof. Herrmann. They are, therefore, a synopsis of his general theological view. They were intended by him only for the purpose of lecturing and were never meant to be a book, yet they serve the purpose of a book both lucidly and connectedly. And so far at least as these qualities go the English rendering does them full justice. Not having the text by me I cannot say how far the rendering is close to the original, but it has the high merit that it does not smack of translation at all. So very few books have been rendered out of German into really readable English that the merit of this translation deserves the fullest and warmest appreciation.

To review the book adequately would require a full discussion of Herrmann's whole theological position, and behind that his relation to Ritschl. Nor is it possible to do anything in the way of summary, for the whole book is just summary. Nor is it necessary, because it is a short book not difficult to read, and every one interested in theology should read it for himself.

It consists of a shorter general part and a longer doctrinal. In the first part Herrmann explains his view of how he thinks Christianity is related to science, philosophy, and history. In the second part he deals systematically with the ideas involved in the Christian faith, the method being determined by shewing how the ideas spring from the root of faith. Thus we begin with overcoming the world by the faith created by God, proceed from that to the victory over sin: and only then deal with the historical facts and the doctrine of God. The Doctrine of the Trinity closes the whole as the final expression of monotheism. As the final expression of the Christian idea of salvation it would have been more in place in the sequence of thought. As it is the connexion is far from evident. The doctrine, we are told, 'reminds us that we can only find eternal life in fellowship with God, if he remains unsearchable to us—an eternal mystery'. Surely it sprang from something understood about God and not from mere mystery. Moreover, here Herrmann seems to lapse into the kind of theology he elsewhere opposes. But it is not because any one ought to agree with the whole exposition that the book is to be most earnestly recommended. It is because of a spirit with which it is good to have fellowship and because the thinking is of a kind to stimulate us to think our own thoughts and see our own way.

More recently there have been some who set the pupil above the master. But Herrmann is in no way a forceful original mind like Ritschl, and his debt to Ritschl is very large. But while it is a mistaken judgement, the reason for it is easy to understand. Herrmann made this theology more Christian in temper and gave it more simple and persuasive expression. And this small book gives more idea in short space of what this means than anything else, and certainly than anything else in English, though, of course, 'The Communion with God' has an atmosphere which a theological summary can hardly possess. Yet, largely owing to the quality of the translation, even this is not wholly lacking in this treatise.

Studies of the Psychology of the Mystics, by JOSEPH MARÉCHAL, S.J., translated by ALGAR THOROLD. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, London, 1927.)

THE book consists of six sections which are really six separate essays. The first deals with empirical science and religious psychology. In view of a great deal of recent religious psychology and its very unphilosophical assumptions this is a very necessary task. The work is done with learning and ability, but it is quite unnecessarily technical, and in translation at least much of it suffers just a shade of distortion away from the kind of technical language an English writer would use, which makes both difficult and doubtful reading. The main contention is that it is unscientific to determine the significance of the facts of mysticism beforehand on the arbitrary principle of the unlimited jurisdiction of empirical determinism over the field of human experience. This is mainly directed against Prof. Leuba, and Leuba's withers should be wrung by it. But he is naturally so cheerfully and irresponsibly unphilosophical, that he will probably remain quite unaware of its force.

The second paper on the feeling of presence in mystics and non-mystics is more interesting than convincing. Here, however, is the essential starting-point of enquiry. There can be no question of the state of mind of the mystic, and the whole question is whether it is in any way the means of objective knowledge.

Doubt arises especially under two forms. It is one thing to believe that through experiences we can reach out to what is beyond it, and which yet is the unity by which we bring together what otherwise is scattered and unrelated: and it is quite another to say that by excluding every image and all discursive thought we can reach knowledge.

That is the first, and the second goes with it. It is whether, in point of fact, any increase of spiritual perception has ever come to man through the particular kind of discipline of the mystics. Has there ever in all human history been any good ground for believing that when the mystics come to themselves, 'they find themselves possessed of a distinct knowledge of things, more luminous and more perfect than that of others'? This is true of those who have stirred their thoughts to their furthest reach in face of life's largest demands, as all willing to learn from them may know: but how does the light given by not employing the mind to experience and thought appear?

The third paper is on 'Some Distinctive Features of Christian Mysticism'. The first impression is that there is a great deal too much methodology and that the whole business is largely determined by artifice. The Catholic, no doubt, uses the means of grace, but in so far as he does so, he is not a mystic. The real business is removing all images of the senses, suppressing desire by asceticism, and dismissing thought, to fixed contemplation as it were of a point. What is called renunciation of the ego, is frequently renunciation of it for its right purpose of judging truth and forgetting ourselves in truth, and not for the wrong reason of too much standing between us and the light. Finally we come to the view that this road may lead to the queerest results, but a very sound orthodox Catholic may be trusted on it: which very much looks as if its unity were simply a blank mirror in which to see our own faces.

The next paper deals with Professor Leuba as a psychologist of mysticism. Though what has been established so far cannot be said to leave Leuba entirely without foundation, it has established two important points in opposition to him. The first is that his easy way of assuming psychological explanations is mostly pretty cheap; and that mysticism as an experience, whatever may be said of it as a revelation, is real and genuine. Leuba's explanations might be true in any one case, but it is not true for every case. On both there is very effective criticism. At the same time the importance Leuba ascribes to the sex element in the mystic emotion is neither quite fairly stated nor adequately met.

The last two essays on 'Mystical Grace in Islam' and 'The Comparative Study of Mysticism' widen the discussion as Leuba and others have done. This is obviously necessary, because everywhere mysticism is of astonishing uniformity, and the more so as it becomes complete and exclusive.

In this larger field also there is wide and accurate knowledge, and, in spite of the acknowledged Roman standpoint, great openness of mind and fairness of discussion. Indeed it is this fairness of discussion which makes it plain that mysticism proper, that is, by exclusion of the multiplicity of experiences and direct resort to Divine Unity, is neither a pure auto-suggestion nor a way of knowing reality, but is dependent on the form of mind and the form of experience, which may be either a resting peace and a recollection in days of distraction and distress or of flight and shelter from life's high and exacting requirements. This it is which gives mysticism its perennial interest, and for any one who wishes to study it Father Maréchal's learned and able treatise is an indispensable help.

Rationalism and Orthodoxy of To-day, by J. H. BEIBITZ, M.A. (London: Student Christian Movement, 1927.)

TAKEN as a whole this is an admirable piece of work. First, it shews—what is rare in short treatises which deal with Christian philosophy—adequate knowledge, both scientific and theological. Then it is thought out clearly and presented lucidly and compactly.

The first part discusses evolution, or rather its presupposition and source, mainly by a criticism of Mr Julian Huxley's *Essays of a Biologist.* This is marked by understanding and fairness as well as by judgement. The main contention is that evolution is a developement of mind and presupposes an environment of one mind, of which it is the self-expression in terms of the time-process. This mind is later identified with the Logos. What this is we can only test by the highest values we know, in the assurance that the developement of them can only be from their objective existence.

The rest of the book is taken up with shewing that Christ is the fullest manifestation, and the faith based on Him a rational interpretation of evolution when all its terms are taken into account.

Whether this brings us as far on the road to Catholic orthodoxy as the author believes is doubtful. But, so far as the general argument is concerned, this is secondary, more especially as the author's own beliefs are a good deal less like the beliefs formulated in the fourth century than he supposes.

A more serious matter is that the argument does not really escape from the dominion of the idea of mere process. mainly because the author fails to see the vital importance of what is individual, from the atom up to man, in real progress. Thus the idea of sin is not even mentioned. Yet the truth of Darwinism is the vital importance of the struggle of the individual: and with that goes the leading role played by function in evolution, with the evolution of the structure as its mere accompaniment. Failure to function is to fall out of the race. This fact must be vital for theology as well as science. For that the mere idea of the Logos is inadequate as the form of God's revelation, whether in creation or in spiritual experience. Yet, in spite of this shortcoming, the book is very warmly to be commended.

J. OMAN.

Religious Assent: A discussion of the meaning and ground of its certainty, by DOM MARK PONTIFEX. (Constable & Co., Ltd., London, 1927.)

THE author tells us that his object is to remove an objection against religious belief, which he states thus: 'When so many able men who have studied the subject disagree, how can you presume to be certain of the truth of your creed, and to claim that this certainty is reasonable?' He meets this difficulty as satisfactorily as is possible without full and precise enquiry as to what reasonableness consists in, and without discriminating, with all explicitness, between the reasonableness predicable of an individual's mental activities as they are for him, with his particular conditionings and opportunities, and the reasonableness predicable of them as estimated from the point of view of common or 'universal' knowledge. It is perhaps only when, towards the end of the book, certain issues, that are of more or less incidental nature, are discussed, that the writer's abstinence from thrashing out these remoter questions becomes deleterious to his argumentation. In spite of the dangerous ambiguity of the word 'certainty', which denotes both logical certification and subjective convincedness, the author seldom, if ever, swerves from exclusive use of the term in its latter sense. And he has no difficulty in shewing that logically certified knowledge, such as rationalism claims, and uses for disparagement of belief, is not forthcoming. The assent or belief with which this book is concerned, and which is unfortunately also called faith, is the partly alogical conviction entertained towards what, logically, is but probable. Conative factors are involved, which the writer, again unfortunately, calls by the name of 'will'.

When Dom Pontifex passes from subjective certitude or convincedness to objective certainty of the religious credendum, his argument seems more disputable. He relies, e. g., on human needs. Religion is necessary—i. e. needful—for man's higher life, his 'rest', &c., and certainty, as a mental attitude, is necessary to religion. But the needfulness of belief (believing) to man's higher life does not, without more ado, imply the truth of the credendum; for, until we have established that the universe is so constituted as to respect and satisfy man's aspirations, &c., there is no reason to assume that it must do so; the 'intolerable' may be fact. This, however, is but a side-issue; the volume is primarily concerned with the psychological, rather than with the logical or epistemological, study of religious assent. Throughout the main argument these points of view are kept distinct, and there the author's teaching is essentially sound. One small error should be mentioned, by the way: Dom Pontifex (p. 199) equates indecision (doubt) with unbelief, presumably meaning disbelief; whereas it would rather seem that unbelief in a proposition is belief in its negative, while indecision is neither belief nor disbelief, but wholly distinct from either, because of absence, or equivalence, of *pros* and *cons*. More serious, however, is the representation (pp. 210 ff) that 'if we are convinced ourselves of the truth of Christianity, it would appear contradictory to countenance suspension of assent in other Christians' [in others?], and that we must regard doubt of such truth as apostasy. Here it would seem that there is real confusion of epistemological and psychological standpoints, such as has elsewhere been avoided. Assuredness or psychological convincedness, that we are right in our belief, certainly involves *convincedness* that unbelievers are wrong; but inasmuch as psychological certitude is quite distinct from logical certainty, and is a personal affair, it does not, of itself, authorize us to affirm that they are wrong, or that we *know* them to be in error. The very right we claim 'to live', so to say, involves the duty to 'let live': compromise may, indeed, be impossible; but toleration is not precluded, and charity would shrink from branding honest doubt as apostasy. Similarly, belief, after such weighing of grounds and evidences as has, up to date, been possible for us, does not entitle us to the conviction that no future examination can possibly upset our belief. Probability is always relative to knowledge-data: what once was probable may become untenable, and belief that once was reasonable may become unreasonable. The resolve always to believe, which seems here to be commended (p. 212), savours of credulity, and is comparable to the old sectarian belief in assurance of salvation or impossibility of lapse from grace. Conclusions of this kind do not seem to follow from the writer's excellent vindication of the right to believe on non-coercive evidence, but are rather reached by desertion of the psychological point of view from which he sets out.

F. R. TENNANT.

The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin: a historical and critical study, by NORMAN POWELL WILLIAMS, D.D., Fellow and Chaplain of Exeter College, Oxford. (Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., London, 1927.)

IN this large volume are contained, considerably expanded, the Bampton Lectures of 1924. The author, now Lady Margaret Professor in the University of Oxford, describes it as 'a systematic study' of the doctrines of the Fall and of Original Sin 'which will not merely investigate the origins of the Fall-doctrine and trace the course of its development, but will seek to determine the extent of its acceptance by orthodox Christianity, and the degree of validity, if any, which it may claim before the bar of reason' (viii f). The book, accordingly, falls into two parts. The first and by much the longer part, lectures one to six, is historical and avoids criticism and comment: its purpose is to 'ascertain the origin and fix the essence' (12) of these doctrines as formulated and believed in the past. The second, lectures seven and eight, is 'theological or philosophical, devoted to a discussion of their validity and truth' (12), and contains a reinterpretation in psychological terms of Original Sin and a speculative account and defence of the Fall. Though occupying but a seventh of the book, it is in the two final lectures that the primary purpose of the book is to be sought: but there can be little doubt that it is in the detailed historical survey of the first six lectures that its chief value will be found.

The purpose of the historical survey, which extends from the origins in post-exilic Judaism to the nineteenth century A. D., is to ascertain to what extent and to what form of the doctrines of Original Sin and the Fall historical Christianity has actually been committed. And this explains why it is that, while thought before Augustine is treated very fully, thought after Augustine is dealt with more cursorily, and thought since the Reformers merely touched upon. The test applied is the Vincentian canon *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*, employed 'solely as a scientific and not as an authoritarian test' (396). Dr Williams seems to suggest (396) that by this means it is possible to discover 'the amount, or the kind, of Fall doctrine which is necessarily presupposed by the Christian religion as such'. To gauge the mind of Christianity, however, by seeking 'the common substratum, or the highest common factor' (313, &c.) contained in its diverse manifestations must always be an inadequate method of procedure: and, if the authority of this 'orthodox' substratum is given up, such an orthodoxy has no great importance. Nevertheless, it has the merit of indicating (and this is a principal purpose of Dr Williams's examination) that many of the more extreme developements of the theory, often referred to vaguely as 'the ecclesiastical doctrine', cannot claim to be more than opinions held here or there or at some time by Christians. Indeed, Dr Williams claims (313) 'that the genuinely "Catholic" doctrine of Fall and of Original Sin is simply and strictly identical with the New Testament doctrine'; 'Catholic' being taken as equivalent to the 'highest common factor' referred to above.

The origins of the Fall-doctrine are traced in Judaism, emphasis being laid on the fact that it was eventually one, and not the most prominent, form of Jewish speculation, viz. that based on the story of Gen. iii, which took root in Christianity, to the exclusion of the originally more prevalent teaching which sought the origin of sin either in the story of the fallen angels of Gen. vi or in the doctrine of the 'evil imagination' (*yēçer ha-raʿ*). Dr Williams admits that there is no evidence that Jesus ever spoke of a Fall; but he attributes undue importance to the fact that there is nothing to shew that he ever controverted it. The Pauline passages (Rom. v, vi, vii; 1 Cor. xv; Gal. v) are examined at length; and St Paul, 'the prince and master of all Christian Fall-speculators' (519), is singled out as the main channel through which the theory entered and became established in Christian thought. The scarcity of evidence for the doctrine between Paul and Irenaeus is noted as remarkable, and its rapid and extensive revival thereafter explained as the result, on the one side of the canonization of the Pauline letters as sacred scripture, on the other of the conflict with Gnosticism which demanded a solution of the problem of evil which should avoid both dualism and the ascription of evil to God.

In the period which follows Irenaeus two main tendencies are distinguished, the one characteristic of the Hellenic East, the other of the Latin (especially of the African) West. Both accepted the Fall as a fact, identified it with the sin of Adam, and admitted its consequences to mankind; but the former tended to regard man's original state as one of immaturity, to understand the Fall as a mere *privatio*, to lay little stress on physical generation as the means of the transmission of its consequences, interpreting this mystically or by a theory of ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, and to interpret the Adam story allegorically; whilst the latter tended to believe in 'original righteousness', to see the Fall as a *depravatio*, to regard physical generation as intrinsically evil and the means of transmitted corruption, and to interpret the story of Gen. iii literally, enhancing its details. These two tendencies are explained, psychologically, as due to temperament: the Hellenic religious temperament being characteristically 'once-born', the African Latin characteristically 'twice-born'. And it is insisted that the root of the whole theory of a Fall is in the experience of 'deep, searching, self-abhorring penitence' (89). The contribution of Augustine to the developement of the doctrine is naturally examined with some fullness, in contrast with that of Pelagius and his associates: with the result that, in spite of the profound influence exercised by Augustine upon subsequent Western speculation on the Fall, it is maintained that neither his theory of 'original righteousness' nor that of *originalis reatus* can be said to have won acceptance *ubique et ab omnibus* or to be 'Catholic'; and it is held that they are 'worthless from the point of view of modern thought' (380, 389).[1]

The history between Augustine and the Reformers is treated as the early triumph of a modified Augustinianism followed by its gradual decline: this period being again marked by the conflict of the 'once-born' and 'twice-born' tendencies, the decisions of the Council of Trent representing a compromise strongly favouring the former or anti-Augustinian tendency. But in the Reformers—the differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism are regarded as inconsiderable (427)—the 'Augustinian' view lived again and received its most extreme and ruthless developements, culminating in man's 'total depravity'. This fact Dr Williams accounts for, perhaps inadequately, by the fact of the dominating authority of Augustine's writings and the so-called 'twice-born' temperaments of Calvin and in a greater degree of Luther.

This historical survey, extending, though not without some needless repetition, to 450 pages, is marked by a thorough and first-hand examination of the material, supplied with full references to the original literature; and, as such, it is a very valuable contribution to the history of the doctrines with which it deals. It is most exhaustive for the first three Christian centuries; but scholarly and thorough throughout. As an interpretation of thought, however, it is weaker than as a record of opinions. In no sense can Dr Williams's survey be regarded as superseding that of Dr F. R. Tennant's *Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall &c.*, and the constant obligations of the later to the earlier work are acknowledged. The two differ, however, in arrangement, and not seldom in conclusions. Moreover Dr. Williams's purpose is somewhat different, since he attempts to estimate the sense in which, and the extent to which, historical Christianity is committed to the doctrines in question, rather than to trace their sources. Consequently, the survey is extended to include Augustine and representative thinkers of later times.

---

[1] The point, however, is made that it is false to accuse Pelagianism of minimizing the sense of sin: 'by insisting on the unlimited freedom of the will, and by sweeping away the excuses which may be found in natural weakness or the power of habit it exaggerates the sense of sin . . . to a degree . . . no less intolerable than the opposite error . . .' (357, cf. 461 n.).

This examination, Dr Williams maintains, has shewn that 'original righteousness' and 'original guilt', though widely held, are not included in that common substratum of Christian opinion which he calls 'Catholic'; this regards Original Sin rather as an 'inherited infirmity'. Lecture seven is an attempt to reinterpret Original Sin, so taken, in terms of psychology (or, as it appears rather to be, of medical psychotherapy). The result is not satisfactory. A sketch is given of 'conation and action as these are given in the modern picture of human personality' (475), and the reinterpretation effected in terms of it. There is naturally small scope in a few pages for any independent treatment of these difficult and controversial matters: but so metaphorical an account as is here given—with its analogies of buildings, pipes, windows, wires, sponges, &c.—would be inadequate for the purpose, even if it could be accepted as other than highly figurative and speculative. The 'herd-instinct' is accepted as the basis of the 'ethical sentiment', and the 'weakness of will', in which the 'infirmity' of original 'sin' is held to consist, is identified with the 'weakness or shallowness of the "herd-instinct", relatively to the other two primary instincts of human nature' (480); and it is claimed that this discloses the secret of the 'interior dislocation of man's being which historical Christianity has steadfastly affirmed to exist, and which forms the presupposition of its redemptive and sacramental scheme' (480). From this it would seem to follow, and it is perhaps admitted (457 f), that the inherited infirmity, so far as it is inherited, is not 'sin', nor even moral, at all.

'Original sin' being thus reinterpreted, an effort is made to account for the dislocation in which it consists by means of a reinterpreted doctrine of a Fall. This is conditioned by the assumption made throughout that the doctrine of the Fall is essentially a Theodicy, in fact that it is *the* contribution of Christianity to the solution of the problem of evil, comparable with, but antagonistic to, the two chief rival theories of dualism and 'unmoral monism': belief in a Fall making it possible to believe in God as good and as creator whilst still maintaining the reality of evil. The historical character of the Adam story is given up; and the idea of an individual fall of each soul in a pre-natal existence is rejected as implying an untenable view of pre-existence: yet that each man is the Adam of his own soul is said not to account for that inherited infirmity which has been previously maintained. The implications of evolution are but slightly considered, except in a brief and (one may feel) inadequate criticism of Dr Tennant's *Hulsean Lectures.* The solution is found in what must be called an uncritical and even fantastic account of the World Soul or *anima mundi*, the first product of creation, identified now with the Stoic Logos Spermatikos, now with Bergson's *élan vital.* This World Soul, created wholly good, 'at the beginning of Time, *in some transcendental and incomprehensible manner* [*italics* mine] . . . turned away from God and in the direction of Self, thus shattering its own interior being' (526). Thus creation became apostate: and with it all forms of life, 'from the bacillus up to man' (524), which are derived from it 'by its bifurcation and ramification into a manifold of distinct individuals and entelechies' (523). Thus the Fall consists in a 'pre-cosmic vitiation of the whole Life-Force, when it was still one and simple' (523).

Leaving aside the question of whether there is any evidence for such a theory, we may note a few points. Is it true that the Fall-doctrine is primarily a Theodicy? But, granting that it is so, how does the rebellion of the World-Soul at the beginning of time offer any solution of the problem of evil? Rather it makes of it a problem as 'transcendental and incomprehensible' as the theory here offered for its solution. That sin should exist in a world of struggle and growth, though not fully comprehensible, is at least not wholly unintelligible if the goal of the process (at least in man) is a moral achievement inconceivable except as the result of effort and battle: but how shall it be explained in the World-Soul, the original creation, created 'free, personal, and self-conscious' (525) and filled with the 'beauty and glory' (523) of God? And is the problem made lighter by finding 'the continuity and homogeneity of evil throughout all ranks of organised life' (524) in the world of a Father in Heaven? The Christian solution—if such it can be called—seems rather to be sought, and to have been found, in the fact that, in the presence of the Cross, which is God's love revealed through a work of evil, it has been possible to hold still that the world, for all its evil, is, not the product of a vitiated life-force struggling back to God, but of God's ever-present creation realizing through the way of hazard and hardship a goodness which can be won in no other way.

The doctrine of the Fall is perhaps rather an Anthropology. It is, no doubt, the product, in part at least, 'of that profound and poignant experience of self-condemnation' (312); yet, so far from expressing 'that true conception of human nature, its power and its weakness, which contains the key to the world-old problems of social regeneration and reform' (485), it would appear singularly incapable of contributing to the construction, so urgently required and so strangely lacking, of a Doctrine of Man which shall do justice, as the Fall does not, to the implications of the Christian doctrine of Incarnation, God in Man, the implications of which are as important for an 'anthropology' as for a 'theology'. To the knowledge of the past history of the Doctrine of the Fall and of Original Sin Dr Williams's book makes a valuable addition: to the construction of a Christian Doctrine of Man, however, it makes no contribution.

J. S. BOYS SMITH.

Christ, the 'Man from Heaven', A study of 1 Cor. 15, 45–47 in the light of the Anthropology of Philo Judaeus, by Rev. BASIL AUGUSTINE STEGMANN, O.S.B., S.T.L. (Catholic Univ. of America N.T. Studies, No. VI). (Washington D.C., 1927.)

AFTER summarizing theories which have been advanced as to the source of the Pauline idea of the Man from heaven, the writer settles down to the real subject of his enquiry, which is a comparison of the Pauline idea with Philo's doctrine of man. A lengthy examination of *De op. Mundi* and other texts leads him to question the generally received view of Philo's teaching. Philo distinguishes between the heavenly and the earthly man and it is generally supposed that he held the creation of the heavenly man, who is also the γενικὸς ἄνθρωπος, to be told in Gen. i 26 and the creation of the earthly man in Gen. ii 7. The writer thinks that Philo has been misread: the second creation narrative is regarded by Philo as an allegorical *résumé* of the first and it is the creation of the second, composite, historical man that is related both in Gen. i and again in Gen. ii. The heavenly man was created with the rest of the κόσμος νοητός on the first day of creation. This is apparently nowhere directly stated by Philo, but Dom Stegmann thinks that it must be inferred.

Philo's language is occasionally loose, but the following considerations seem to me to be decisive against Dom Stegmann:—

(i) *De op. Mundi* 134, referring to Gen. ii 7, contrasts ὁ νῦν πλασθεὶς ἄνθρωπος with ὁ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονὼς πρότερον. The latter clearly answers to the wording of Gen. i 26, and the reference cannot be called doubtful. Moreover Dom Stegmann's interpretation is ruled out by πρότερον, for, according to *De op. Mundi* 26, the creation of the first day was not in time, and Philo would not speak of it as πρότερον.

(ii) *Leg. alleg.* ii 12, 13 makes it clear that Philo did not regard the second creation narrative as an allegorical summary of the first. The first, he says, records the creation of the γένη, and the second the creation of the εἴδη.

(iii) Dom Stegmann misreads his texts when he says 'we must conclude that the *γένος ἄνθρωπον* of *De op. Mundi* 76 as well as the *γενικός ἄνθρωπος* of *Leg. alleg.* ii 13—since to both is attributed the distinction into male and female—are identical with the generic (so Dom Stegmann) *πλασθεὶς ἄνθρωπος*, 'the earthly man'. Philo is consistent throughout, and his point is that the generic man includes both male and female, while the specific man is *either* male *or* female.

Passing to St Paul the writer notes the important differences which distinguish the Pauline view of the second Adam or the Man from heaven from the Philonic 'heavenly man'. These differences are not less considerable on the usual interpretation of Philo than they are on Dom Stegmann's; indeed, so far as comparison with St Paul is concerned, it is hard to see what is the direct bearing of Dom Stegmann's theory on the issue. Dom Stegmann fails to find any direct point of contact between St Paul's conception and either the mythological *Urmensch* or the pre-existent Messiah of Jewish Apocalyptic. Christ, pre-existent, is 'in the form of God' and Paul associates manhood with the Incarnation alone. 'To say it in the order of the content Christ was God *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*'. He then proceeds to investigate the interpretation of the Greek Fathers (it is unfortunate that a 'classical interpretation' of Athanasius should come from the *Contra Apoll.*) and he has little difficulty in shewing that this line of interpretation (which on its merits has much to commend it) is in line with their teaching. 'Their consentient testimony', he holds, 'should be authoritative', for 'they were able to control both the linguistic and the christological traditions, coming down from the apostolic writers'.

Misprints of Greek words are very frequent.

The Gospel according to S. Matthew, edited by B. T. D. Smith, M.A., with Introduction and Notes. (Cambridge, 1927.)

A NEW edition of St Matthew's Gospel for the Cambridge Greek Testament is a very welcome addition to the literature of the New Testament. Carr's edition, which was reprinted for the eleventh time in 1913, was first published in 1881. It has done good service, but by this time it has become a definitely misleading book to put into the hands of a student whether at school or at the University. The author of the new edition shews an easy mastery of much of the very extensive literature, British and foreign, which has appeared on the Gospels in recent years. The forty pages of Introduction contain a freshly written account of Jewish Christianity, a careful examination of the characteristics of the community for which the Gospel was compiled, a review of the sources and an analysis of the plan of the work, and lastly a discussion as to date, authorship, and place of origin. Mr Smith holds that although the Gospel was early adopted by the Church of Antioch, the lack of definite traces of Pauline influence tells against the theory that it originated in that Church.

The notes are freshly written. There is sufficient illustration from ancient sources, and sufficient reference to modern literature, but Mr Smith's independent judgement is felt at all points.

It must always be a difficulty to decide what should or should not be included in a book of this character. In two directions it seems to me that the book would be strengthened by somewhat fuller treatment. First: the notes contain frequent references to the textual authorities (cited as a rule from Souter's apparatus) for various readings. If these are not to be excluded, ought not the Introduction to contain some guidance on textual criticism to elucidate the notes? The second point concerns the subject-matter of the Gospel: Mr Smith concludes a brief paragraph in his Introduction on Q with these words: 'Burkitt's conclusion may be unwelcome, but it is difficult to withhold assent to it—"I am persuaded that Q is to us, and must remain, a collection of disconnected fragments"'. This may be true, but it is not the whole truth. The material common to Matthew and Luke forms a large part of the first Gospel and it contains the most valuable collection we possess of the teachings of Jesus. Some attempt to relate different elements in the sayings and parables and to underline dominant thoughts and dispositions which may lie behind 'disconnected fragments' would strengthen the exposition which follows in the notes. Mr Smith would perhaps reply that the reader should do this for himself. The reader in any case feels himself in the hands of a competent and candid guide.

The Epistle of St James and Judaic Christianity, by G. H. Rendall, B.D., Litt.D., LL.D. (Cambridge, 1927.)

Dr Rendall takes as his starting-point the superscription of the Epistle of James and argues that it plainly claims the Epistle as the work of the brother of the Lord. If the claim is to be made good, it must be on the ground of the internal evidence of the Epistle and its congruity with known characteristics of James. Dr Rendall proceeds accordingly to collect and to discuss what evidence we have as to the life of James and his position in the early Church, and he finds it to harmonize with the evidence of the Epistle. Literary connexion between Romans and this Epistle must be assumed, and there is sufficient reason for holding that the priority lies with James. The Epistle was probably published by the Lord's brother at some date subsequent to the Council at Jerusalem between 49 and 55. The clue alike to the contents of the Epistle and to its remarkable omissions is the mediating position of St James. 'James stands for the age of transition, reluctant to break away from the old moorings, and clinging to the belief that the breach did not go beyond verbal controversies such as could be averted or closed by mutual charity.'

Dr Rendall's treatment is always scholarly, and if his argument does not convince, this seems to me to be due to an initial failure in estimating the strength of the positive argument for accepting authorship by the brother of the Lord. Dr Rendall holds not only that the Epistle is the work of James, but also that it was familiarly known to, and used by, the Apostles Peter and Paul. This makes it a document of first-rate importance for the history of the first generation. But if this be so, is it not remarkable that the Epistle held such an uncertain position in the N.T. Canon, and that down to the time of Eusebius its authorship was clearly regarded as doubtful? Perhaps the early Church was unduly hesitating, but the hesitation of early times may suggest the wisdom of at least a preliminary hesitation to-day.

The second preliminary question, to which, as it seems to me, Dr Rendall does less than justice, is the problem of language. Is it probable that the leader of Judaic Christianity at Jerusalem would have written with such ready command of Greek and would have fallen so frequently into turns of phrase which may be closely paralleled from the language of popular Greek philosophy? Dr Rendall reminds us that James came from Galilee and that Galilee was the home of Meleager the epigrammatist and Theodorus the rhetorician. But what is the probability that Greek influences of this character were felt in the synagogue and the artisan's home at Nazareth?

And, lastly, is it probable that if the leader of the Church at Jerusalem wrote a pastoral in the early years of the fifth decade, he would have been able and willing to avoid all reference to the questions which were then agitating the Church at home and abroad?

In default of conclusive literary arguments for the early date of the Epistle, our attitude towards Dr Rendall's main thesis cannot but be affected by our judgement on these preliminary questions, and Dr Rendall's book at its strongest does not do more than suggest possible ways by which the difficulties might be met.

J. M. Creed.

Some Authentic Acts of the Early Martyrs: translated with Notes and Introduction by E. C. E. OWEN. (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1927.)

THIS attractive and learned book may be unreservedly recommended to the general reader as well as to scholars. Here we have a graceful yet close version of a number of priceless documents never before presented together in English, with introductions and notes adequate to their purpose. The documents referred to are the Martyrdom of S. Polycarp, Acts of SS. Carpus, Papylus, and Agathonica, Acts of SS. Justin and his Companions, Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, Acts of the Scillitan Saints, Passion of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, Acts of S. Cyprian, Acts of SS. Fructuosus and his Deacons, Passion of SS. James and Marian, Martyrdom of S. Marinus, Acts of S. Marcellus, Passion of S. Cassian, Passion of S. Procopius; in other words they cover a period of about 150 years, from the middle of the second to the beginning of the fourth century. With regard to the *Asiarch* (p. 131) it might have been mentioned that he had to do with the worship of the Emperor and of Rome; the charge of 'Thyestean banquets' is not specified in Pliny's famous letter (p. 140); the word *uexare* is stronger than 'to annoy', probably 'to shake' with Bindley (p. 79); it might have been mentioned that Saturn in Africa (p. 156) corresponded to the Semitic Moloch; *discincta* (p. 164) 'unbelted', suggests merely that the robe flowed down to the feet, not that it was open in front; *birthday* (p. 166) probably means 'birthday', as it was the custom to celebrate both the Emperor's birthday and the anniversary of his accession to power, as two distinct days.

The Passion of S. Perpetua: an English translation with Introduction and Notes by R. WATERVILLE MUNCEY, M.A. (Dent, London and Toronto [1927].)

MR MUNCEY has based the introduction and notes to this work on the edition of Dr Armitage Robinson, but he has failed to make the alterations demanded by the lapse of time since 1891. Thus we find 'Mr Maunde Thompson, now Librarian of the British Museum', and 'the present archivist [of Monte Cassino], Dom Ambrogio Amelli': sometimes also, as on p. 17, the *ipsissima verba* of Dr Robinson are used without the inverted commas, though general acknowledgement of the indebtedness is recorded in the preface. The printing is often inaccurate, and the statements made are sometimes incorrect. The reference to the Latin *Corpus* on p. 1 is incorrect, and the name

Perpetua occurs in *CIL* viii 457. It ought also to have been pointed out that the masculine *Perpetuus* is fairly frequent: there is no special significance attaching to the rarity of the feminine. Sirmond has been italianized to Sirmondi (p. 5, twice). Mr Muncey has overlooked a fourth sermon on SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, discovered by Dom Morin, published in 1917, and assigned by him with some hesitation to Quodvultdeus. The statements on p. 16 about the early editions do not accord with Dr Robinson's. On p. 25, n. 1, *matrimonaliter* (sic) should be *matronaliter*, and 'Willmann's' should be 'Wilmanns''; on p. 27, n. 2, 'Heremmianus' should surely be 'Herennianus'; on p. 43, n. 1, 'Lampridus' should be 'Lampridius'; on p. 56 'Thevaste' should be 'Theveste'; on p. 63 the *De Amicitia* is quoted as Augustine's, but ever since 1685 at least it has been considered spurious. The translation is rather clumsy, and shews that the author is hardly competent for his task; c. 4, 'underneath', should be 'from underneath'; c. 5, neither the force of *hoc* nor that of *constitutus* is understood; c. 6, the first sentence has three misrenderings; worse, in c. 10, *expoliata* 'stripped' is taken as *expolita*, 'smoothed down', whatever that may mean. The little book, despite the translator's incompetence, may minister to the spiritual life of its readers.

An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin, by the Rev. H. P. V. NUNN, M.A. (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1927.)

THE first edition of this work appeared in 1922, and the appearance of the second after a five years' interval suggests that it has been found useful. The misconceptions to which the brief title might give rise have been removed in the preface to the new edition, and a number of errors present in the earlier edition has been removed. The remarks on the Latin scriptures in the introduction might have been written forty years ago, so little are they up to date, and it is disconcerting to find three errors in the text of the quotations from Jerome's fifty-third Epistle fronting the title-page (*omnes* omitted in the first line; *mei* for *meis*; and *Noli* for *Nolo*). The natural prejudice felt by classical students against the later Latin will be in great part removed when the texts of the later writers are properly edited, and of this letter of Jerome we have two recent critical editions, that of Hilberg (1910) and that of Quentin (1926). If Mr Nunn will only master the bibliography of his subject, and then go through his book carefully, his third edition will be a greater improvement on the second than the second has been on the first.

The Hymn Te Deum and its Author, by A. E. BURN, D.D. (The Faith Press, Ltd., London, 1926.)

DR BURN, whose untimely death in November last is regretted by many outside the ranks of scholars, rendered one of the greatest of his services to learning when he published in 1905 (Cambridge University Press) the *editio princeps* of the works of Niceta of Remesiana. In the course of that book he had occasion to include a critical text of the *Te Deum*. Probably few now doubt the ascription of the hymn to Niceta of Remesiana, a view first suggested by Dom Morin. I have often had occasion, however, in conversation with educated Christians, to find how few were aware of this important discovery, and it was a happy thought of Dr Burn to issue, in a popular volume of astonishing cheapness, such an attractive discussion of the whole question. The book is divided into five chapters and five appendixes. The chapters are entitled: 'The Hymn *Te Deum*'; 'S. Niceta of Remesiana'; 'S. Niceta as a Teacher'; 'Public Worship in the Fourth Century'; 'Ancient Plainsong and Modern Music'. The short appendixes comprise an edition of the Latin text, among other matters of interest. The photograph of Bela Palanka in Serbia (the modern representative of Remesiana) has been repeated from the Cambridge book, and there is also a photograph of a page of the British Museum MS (Add. 37517, saec. X ex., S. England), showing the reading *numerari* (for the *munerari* of all other known MSS). The significance of the fact that this MS once belonged to Abp. Cranmer will not be lost on churchmen and others who use the Prayer Book version. The Dean wished the following errors to be corrected: read 'Add. MS 37517' for 'Vesp. A. 1' (p. 12); 'Add. 18859' for 'Lat. 8824' (p. 84), and 'Cassino 538. Cent. xii' for 'Casino 538. Cent. xi' (p. 84). All churchmen and many others, whether they possess the *editio princeps* of Niceta or not, should acquire the present work.

A. SOUTER.

The Works of Fastidius, edited and translated by R. S. T. HASLEHURST, B.D. (The Society of SS. Peter & Paul, Limited, Westminster House, Great Smith Street, S.W. 1, 1927.)

FASTIDIUS is a name little known to students, and it is a grave defect in Mr Haslehurst's method of presenting his material that he does not give at the outset a clear statement of the literary history of his subject, but leaves his readers to pick it up for themselves from his references to the work of previous investigators. Let me then summarize the facts, to lessen the labours of any students of Patristics who may light on the volume before us.

All that is actually known about Fastidius is the statement of Gennadius (*de viris ill.* ch. lvi) that he was a bishop of the Britons who wrote to one Fatalis a book on the Christian Life (*de uita Christiana*), and another on remaining a Widow (*de uiduitate servanda*), and that the teaching in them was sound and to the honour of God (*sana et Deo digna doctrina*). And Gennadius mentions him between Celestius of Rome (bp. 422–432) and Cyril of Alexandria (bp. 412, but best known from his activities in the Nestorian affair from 429), from which we may infer that Gennadius placed him in the early part of the fifth century—that is to say, that he was a contemporary (younger perhaps) of Pelagius in Britain before Augustinianism had influenced Christian doctrine. So he was probably 'Pelagian' in his doctrine, and as the sympathies of Gennadius were not 'Augustinian' he may well have found nothing amiss with the two books of Fastidius which he mentions.

These books were not supposed to be extant till the middle of the seventeenth century when it was observed that the words 'Fastidii episcopi' had been added by a later hand to the title *de vita Christiana* of a treatise in letter form among the works of Augustine contained in a MS of Monte Cassino of the xi–xii century. Holsten prepared an edition of this pseudo-Augustinian tract which was published in 1663 (two years after his death) as the lost works of Fastidius, on the supposition that the two were here combined in one, and this identification was accepted by the Benedictine editors of Augustine and afterwards. The tract is so printed in Migne *P. L.* 50. It is manifestly 'Pelagian' in character.

There are difficulties in the way of the identification. Gennadius says that Fastidius wrote 'ad Fatalem quendam', and this letter is to a woman. 'Quendam' might be an error for *quamdam*. Again, while it is all about the Christian life and is addressed to a widow, it is only in the last chapter that widowhood is dealt with, and there is no stress on maintaining it; and again there is no break between this short chapter and what precedes. We were, however, thus supposed to have in our hands the two writings of Fastidius.

Then in 1890 C. P. Caspari (*Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten*, Christiania, 1890) published a number of Letters and Tracts: two letters unpublished before from a Munich MS of viii–ix century and a Salzburg MS ix–x century, and a tract and three letters from a Vatican MS ix–x century which had been published by Splanius (a Spaniard) at Rome in 1571 as the works of Pope Sixtus III (432–440).

With overflowing learning Caspari pursues an exhaustive examination of these six writings—thought, style, language; shewing the close relationship of idea and expression between them and the numerous actual parallelisms. They are manifestly Pelagian in character: the last four are really treatises that seem to expand and work out the ideas of the two first, which are genuine letters with many personal touches. One literary individuality speaks in the two groups. It is not the same as speaks in the Letter of Pelagius to Demetrias, and so it cannot be Pelagius himself. It very well might be, Caspari goes on, Fastidius. But there are no clear resemblances between these six pieces and the pseudo-Augustinian *de vita Christiana* which was then attributed to Fastidius, and so Caspari, regarding that as a settled question, was obliged to leave the authorship of his six pieces open, to some other, that is, than Fastidius.

In reviewing the work of Caspari, Duchesne expressed his opinion that the claims of Fastidius were superior to those of any one else; and then in 1898 Dom Morin surveyed the position in an article (Le 'De Vita Christiana' de l'évêque breton Fastidius et le livre de Pélage 'ad viduam') in the *Revue Bénédictine* vol xv pp. 481 ff.

Caspari had marshalled a strong array of reasons for attributing the pseudo-Augustinian tract to Pelagius himself, especially in that it contains in ch. xi the notorious Pharisaical prayer which was brought up against Pelagius at the Synod at Diospolis in Palestine. Morin shewed that the arguments on the other side which led Caspari to acquiesce in the received opinion that it was by Fastidius were due to misunderstanding of some of the evidence; he assigned that tract to Pelagius, and he claimed as the real *de vita Christiana* of Fastidius the first of Caspari's own pieces—a claim which, as he says, on the strength of Caspari's elaborate investigation, carries with it the other five pieces. None of them answers to Gennadius's description of the second of the two writings of Fastidius which were all he had read or knew, but Dom Morin can fill the gap. There is a letter on the very subject *de uiduitate servanda* among writings attributed to Caesarius (Migne *P. L.* 67. 1094) which Morin says has no phrase in it definitely Caesarian and so may be identified with the work of Fastidius.

That, then, being the situation, Mr Haslehurst reprints the six texts of Caspari and the letter attributed to Caesarius, and labels his book 'the Works of Fastidius'.

I do not know whether Mr Haslehurst has any right to republish Caspari's texts: nor am I myself satisfied that the evidence of authorship is sufficient to justify the title he gives them. For them as well as for his introduction to them he is entirely dependent on Caspari and Morin, and any student of the subject must still base his study on Caspari's careful and exhaustive work. Mr Haslehurst's fifty pages of confused Introduction are no substitute. If Caspari's work is to be carried a stage further, it could be done by a classification of subjects and references to the passages which shew the writer's point of view, and we might be given a portrait-sketch of the man from the materials furnished.

In Caspari's book there are 167 pages of admirably printed Latin text with critical notes and identification of Biblical quotations. These pages Mr Haslehurst takes over, except the critical notes, from which he only quotes rarely, with an occasional emendation of his own and sometimes a slip of the pen which he does not detect in his translation even when it makes nonsense (e.g. p. 34 the second *pauperem* at the end of § 1 is his error of copying for Caspari's *divitem*).

Mr Haslehurst thus makes no attempt at producing a critical text though the need for it is clear and has been urged (see J. Baer *De operibus Fastidii* 1902, referred to by Bardenhewer).

It must also be noted that, though Caspari could see no resemblance in style between his six pieces and the pseudo-Augustinian tract mentioned above, Baer claims the latter as by the same hand as the former, and Morin agrees (*Revue d'histoire ecclés.* 1904 p. 258). So it also should by parity of reasoning be added to the *corpus* of the works of 'Fastidius', and Dom Morin is now ready to identify it with the second of the writings mentioned by Gennadius although it is only the final chapter that deals with the subject of widowhood.

The translation professes to be of the 'Mais oui'–'But yes' kind. It is both better and worse. It usually reads quite well, fair freedom being taken in dealing with the Latin build of sentence. But Mr Haslehurst perversely interchanges 'but' and 'for' and present and past tenses, and not unfrequently on the pages I have tested misses the sense of the Latin (e.g. p. 4 *sed quid sit Christianum esse, ut epistolae tenor patitur, breviter exponam*, i.e. 'briefly, for that is all one can do in a letter', he renders 'for that is the gist of this letter'; and again p. 284 *in iuvenili corpore canam mentem* does not mean 'your purity of mind considering the youth of your body'—it's the old head on the young shoulders that the bold epithet *canam* expresses). And his translations of the Biblical quotations in his Latin text are often not translations at all, but a substitution of the familiar English version of the passage. Some of our early English translators may have been justified in doing this in view of ideas about the Bible current in their times, but it is surely intolerable in a translator to-day.

Mr Haslehurst depends on both French and German as well as Latin, but, through misunderstanding Dom Morin's explanation of the variations in the text of the famous prayer of Pelagius as given by Jerome and Augustine respectively, he can say that 'the former gives it in Latin, and the latter [i.e. Augustine] in Greek'! Of course he cannot have verified the reference he gives (which, by the way, is not correct).

On broader issues of doctrine, too, he is not a safe guide. Thus he writes (p. xvi) 'the author holds a merely Abelardian view of the Atonement, regarding it as a mere object-lesson in self-abnegation'. This is not a true account of Abelard, nor yet of the teaching of the passage, which represents Christ as insisting that what He had done put His followers in a position to fulfil all His laws. That means that our author recognized in Him and His achievement much more than an object-lesson: if it was that, it was also an enabling act.

In his Preface Mr Haslehurst laments that he has had to 'pay heavily' for the publication of his work, though he has 'given gladly' the 'time and trouble'. The handsome volume is a credit to the publishers and printers. The tracts are not without interest, and a good translation of them in English might be justified. Mr Haslehurst's is good enough for the purpose of giving the reader sufficiently accurate knowledge of their contents. The pity is that a better method was not followed and the whole work carefully revised before it was published at all.

* Since the above review was written there has come to the JOURNAL an off-print from the *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde* vol. 26 of a series of Notes by Dom Morin, 'A travers les manuscrits de Bâle'. No. xii of these announces his discovery in the Library of Bâle of a manuscript of the twelfth century hitherto unknown which contains complete, under the name of Sixtus bishop and martyr, three of the tracts of Caspari's *Corpus* (nos. vi, iii, and iv), and enables the *lacunae* in Caspari's edition to be filled and other parts of the text to be emended. For a critical edition of the works of Fastidius this new manuscript will have high value, and Dom Morin prints at once from it as a specimen with *apparatus criticus* the finale of the tract *De Castitate*.

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER.

Luther and the Reformation. Vol. II: the Breach with Rome (1517–1521), by J. MACKINNON. (Longmans, Green, 1927.)

THE author's second volume follows the first with commendable promptitude. The five years with which it deals are among the most important in the annals of the sixteenth century, for then was worked out the thought of the reformer that resulted in the breach with Rome. It is extraordinary how in every country in Europe, in proportion as the Reformation had free play, representatives of the national genius arose. England produces statesmen and divines, poets and philosophers who exhibit her national characteristics: Loyola is the ideal Spanish knight; Calvin is a typical Frenchman; and Luther himself is a no less typical German. Nationality lay behind them all, especially with Luther, and in some of the best pages in this book Dr Mackinnon demonstrates how much the reformer owed to the support of the German people as well as of their princes. As Giesler observed long ago, one great source of Luther's power was that he learned step by step his lesson, so that the German nation could follow him, and were not startled by a sudden change of old beliefs. Dr Mackinnon adequately points out one most momentous aspect of Luther's work. This was that he emancipated, not merely the learned and the cultivated, but the common people of Germany and of the countries where the Reformation spread, from the fear of the Church and of the clergy. This emancipation, as the author realizes, could never have been successful without the help of dogma, because the power of the Church rested on very formidable dogmas. The Church and the clergy were generally believed to possess some power over the spiritual and eternal welfare of men and women. Doubt as to its extent there might be; but, in Butler's expression, when it came to the point, the ordinary man could not feel 'so certain that there was nothing in it'; and as long as the feeling remained that there might be something in it, kings and people hesitated to offer an absolute defiance to the Pope and the clergy. The practical meaning of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith was that, in the last resort, there was nothing in this indefinable claim of the clergy, for all the faithful were priests. From that moment not merely the enlightened classes, but common men and women were prepared to look the clergy in the face and endure any fate which this might entail upon them. The spiritual world will always have its anxieties, and even terrors, for the human, or at least the Christian, soul; and unless it be delivered from these anxieties by such truths as Luther proclaimed, it will always be in danger of falling under some form of clerical domination. But Luther, both by teaching and by example from 1517 to 1521, lifted this veil of apprehension from the face of the greater part of Europe; and to have done this formed perhaps the greatest of his achievements. An adequate appreciation of it forms a main merit of Dr Mackinnon's book.

It is sometimes forgotten that Luther uttered his protest against indulgences, not as a reformer, but as an orthodox Churchman. The author does not of course forget it, though we are reminded that Leo X was so engrossed with his own pleasures that he never found time to open the dispatches from Germany dealing with this protest. The problem in the twenties of the sixteenth century, as the author implies, was, 'Is there genuine religion or true morality enough in Rome to enable the Roman Church to grasp the rising forces, and to weld them together into a religious harmony?' For the loss of the Germanic world would deprive the Pope of an element on which the future would set store. On the other hand, the loss of the unity of the Church deprived the Germanic world of a controlling and unifying influence which was sadly needed, and led to the erection of barriers between nations and churches which narrowed views and hardened oppositions. The guilt, we think, lies with Rome, which, as Dr Mackinnon makes evident, never really attempted to understand the forces which were aroused, and whose spiritual princes were concerned with selfish intrigues and reckless amusements, while new spiritual energies were clamouring for guidance and recognition.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

William Law and Eighteenth Century Quakerism, by STEPHEN HOBHOUSE. (Allen & Unwin, London, 1927.)

MR HOBHOUSE has made an acceptable addition to the series of Quaker histories which Professor Rufus Jones brought into being. The occasion was a slight one. In 1736 Law was asked by his friend John Byrom to use his powers of persuasion in the case of a devout young churchwoman, Fanny Henshaw, who was on the verge of joining the Friends. He was at the height of his fame and authority, for the *Serious Call* was already published and had run through several editions. The lady was no more than a girl. Law treated her as such. Speaking courteously but without sympathy of the Quakers, he simply insisted on the duty of remaining where she was and of regarding the impulse as a temptation to be resisted. Naturally enough, he failed. It may well be that his tone provoked her to resistance. She lived a long and honoured life among her new friends, and was one of their recognized preachers. Mr Hobhouse has been able to complete the story which hitherto has been imperfectly known, and has printed for the first time parts of the correspondence, and notes of Law upon the case. This little story, unimportant in itself, has led the author to a study of the developement in Law's thought, and he is able to shew that Overton was wrong in his assumption of Law's consistency throughout his career. The logical and pugnacious Laudianism of the Bangorian Letters, in which he speaks incidentally of the Quakers with contempt, was, in fact, abandoned. In later life his religion, as is well known, became less institutional, and among the mystics whom he admired were Friends such as Isaac Pennington, while among his contemporaries were Quakers who shared his devotion to Boehme and valued his own writings. Most of the book does not lend itself to historical criticism. Its readers will find many fresh grounds for appreciation both of Law and of the modern Friends.

Archbishop Bramhall, by W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. (S.P.C.K., London, 1927.)

This is a valuable addition to the series of 'English Theologians'. The historical part is adequate, though sometimes rather vague. Did Bramhall hold his benefice of Kilvington together with his prebends of York and Ripon? Probably he did, for neither prebend was valuable, even though he seems to have resided at Ripon. But that again raises a difficulty. There was only one residential house, which was usually occupied by the Dean. The cathedral registers might throw light on the attention to the parishioners of Ripon which Bramhall is said to have paid. When we get to Ireland, it would be well to bear in mind that the chaplaincy to a Lord Lieutenant was understood to mean the certainty of a bishopric, though it cannot have been usual for a chaplain to earn it by such active service as secretary as Bramhall performed. And some estimate of the proportion of the population in the diocese of Derry which a bishop could hope to influence might well have been given. How many were the immigrants introduced by the London guilds, how many natives, and how many Scots? Only over the first could the bishop rule effectively. It is an interesting evidence of the confidence of the English settlers that on the very eve of the great rebellion Bramhall should have sold Yorkshire lands, his own or his wife's, for the substantial sum of £6,000, and invested the proceeds in County Tyrone. Dr Sparrow Simpson tells the story of Bramhall's troubles well; he might have explained the bishop's presence in south Ireland by the fact that the king had an army in the field there. Nothing was more common than for dispossessed clergy to serve as military chaplains. Bramhall's writings are perhaps taken a little too seriously. The editors of the Anglo-Catholic Library had to find justification in precedents, and to make the best of them. It is impossible for a later generation to quote Bramhall and his compeers with equal confidence. Dr Figgis in his *Divine Right of Kings* quotes from a wide range of literature but almost ignores Bramhall, though he certainly had knowledge of him. And Bramhall won no glory in his debate with old-world weapons against Hobbes. Perhaps a *précis* of the *Just Vindication*, where Bramhall is at his best, would have sufficed as a specimen of his work, too much of which, composed as

Dr Sparrow Simpson shews under the difficulties of exile, was written simply to serve the needs of the day. But the summary given is clear and adequate, and the comments are well informed. Yet the reader should not be allowed to assume, on p. 109, that Bramhall's argument for an original surrender by the people of its rights to the monarchy is his own invention; and in his reply (p. 167) to the Roman taunt that Anglicans were being false to their position in sanctioning Puritan worship by their attendance, Dr Sparrow Simpson has not seen that the force of the criticism lay in the fact that many churchmen, such as the future bishops Bull and Lake, had so far recognized the Independent régime as to hold benefices under it. And he has not done justice to the importance of Grotius in the thought of the time. But the book is both interesting and instructive, not least in shewing that the Laudian position has hearty maintainers at the present day.

The Dean of Winchester's *Thomas Becket* has long been known and valued. We welcome a new edition (Cambridge, University Press, 1926, 8*s.* 6*d.* net) which ought to have been noticed sooner. It is beautifully printed, but a little more care in revision would have been useful. For instance, on p. 147 Vézelay is Cluniac, on p. 149 Cistercian.

E. W. WATSON.

Die Mischna, IV. Seder: *Neziqin: Aboth* (Väter). Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung, nebst einem textkritischen Anhang, von Dr KARL MARTI und Dr GEORG BEER. (Töpelmann, Giessen, 1927.)

THERE is no better way to begin the study of post-Biblical Judaism than to read the *Ethics of the Fathers* with a good Commentary. It may be granted that this is not of great assistance directly in the study of other parts of the Mishna, for *Aboth* differs from them in being almost entirely a compendium of moral teaching, whereas they are concerned with the correctness of ceremonial action. But it not only affords insight into the higher side of Rabbinic religion—'denn es sagt *in nuce*, was der ganze Talmud lehrt: liebe und erfülle die ganze Tora, in ihr spricht dein Gott zu dir!'—but it is also so often used and quoted that to be ignorant of it means failure to appreciate the point of many Talmudic sayings. But what Commentary shall the student use? We English people have thought for many years that none comes up to that by Dr Charles Taylor, and even now we see no reason to change our opinion. For, after all, there have been few Gentile scholars who have mastered Judaism as he had, and have been able to draw upon Talmudic illustrations with the wealth of learning that he possessed. Yet even his second edition was written as far back as 1897, thirty years ago, and it would be strange indeed if a commentary published in 1927 had not much to say which was not known then.

The present volume was begun by Dr Karl Marti, whose loss all scholars deplore, and has been completed by Dr G. Beer, one of the editors of the series. It is on the same lines as other portions of the 'Giessen Mishna', but in this case the Introduction does not run to such an enormous length as sometimes, and extraneous matter is not so evident. It is, in fact, both learned and practical, dealing with the name of the tractate, its position in the Mishna (which certainly needs explanation), its language, style, composition, and its religious value. To the Introduction are appended alphabetical and chronological lists of the scholars mentioned in the tractate, with indices of other names of persons and things, and lists of foreign words and quotations from Scripture. Then follows the Text, with a translation and copious notes, containing many references to recent writers on various details. These make the work indispensable for all who have to teach the subject, or desire to investigate more fully any of the points touched upon in the tract. At the end (as is usual in this series) is a valuable Appendix shewing the various readings of the chief authorities.

The Cult of Santiago, Traditions, Myths, and Pilgrimages: a sympathetic study, by the Rev. JAMES S. STONE, D.D. (Longmans, 1927.)

THE history of the cult of St James the brother of John in the north-west corner of Spain may be studied in three ways. First, the devout Roman Catholic may collect the legends of the fisherman who became the Knight Protector of Spain, and with implicit faith draw out the spiritual lessons that may be learned, and the privilege of imitating the medieval pilgrims in visiting the sacred shrine. Secondly, the rationalizing sceptic may submit to scholarly examination the so-called miracles connected with the coming of St James's body to that out-of-the-way corner of the world, and with its discovery at a later date, and the signs and portents that have accompanied its cult. Thirdly, the tourist, attracted by the beauty of the surroundings, the character of the people, and the romance of past years, may, on his return to his own land, weave together an account of the saint and his doings, and so make a readable and attractive story, regardless alike of critical questions and devotional aspirations. Dr Stone has deliberately chosen this third way.

His work expresses 'a feeling of respect, sometimes even a warm sympathy, for the legends, traditions, and customs which sprang out of the cult of St James, and which so deeply affected the people among whom they prevailed. . . . This book has to do not so much with the origins of the myths and legends advanced as with their results. No reasonable doubt disturbs the supposition that for the most part these results were beneficial.'

With this object Dr Stone traces at some length, and with many digressions, the history of St James, from the day when (some time in the fourteen years that elapsed between the Day of Pentecost and his death at the hands of Herod) he landed in Spain, either at Cartagena or at Tortosa. He then went to Saragossa, where he saw 'a multitude of angels bringing St Mary (the Blessed Virgin) on a throne from Jerusalem in a great glory, and by her a wooden image of her, and a column of jasper. . . . So the Apostle built the church, and the Blessed Mary often came to service there, and in it were preserved the black but comely figure of the Virgin's own self, and the jasper pillar: and there in a chapel in the centre of the cathedral they remain. Diego de Astorga, primate of Spain, on August 17, 1720, excommunicated all persons who questioned this fact; and Risco, writing in 1775, holds "its truth to be established on such firm grounds that nothing now can shake it"' (p. 93).

The above quotation shows the manner and style of our author. But he is not concerned only with the earliest times. Far from it. He traces the history of the cult, the choice of Compostella for its seat, the visits of archbishops and kings, until its gradual decadence. Dr Stone appears to have used the best authorities, and he has produced a book which, though in no sense critical, yet tells the story in an interesting way.

Der Kommentar des David Qimchi zum Propheten Nahum ('Rabbinische Uebungstexte,' 1. Heft), by WALTER WINDFUHR. (Töpelmann, Giessen, 1927.)

THIS is the first instalment of what promises to be a very useful series. For there is but little Rabbinic printed at a low price which the beginner can secure. Qimchi is easy, it is true, but he is the natural starting-point for the student, and it is much to have a portion of his Commentary in decent print and on good paper. Nahum, no doubt, has been chosen for its brevity. Dr Windfuhr gives us a short Introduction, the text of the Prophet with Qimchi's Commentary sufficiently edited, references to all the quotations, with brief statements about persons mentioned, and a short lexicon of non-Biblical words and usages of words. He also adds an explanation of the Targumic phrases that occur. We note that the second portion is to be the Targum on Micah.

A. LUKYN WILLIAMS.

L'Anti-Coran, par un Turc converti (JEAN-MARIA AARIFI). (Ernest Leroux, Paris, 1927.)

THE sub-title of this work is *Le Mahométisme condamné par lui-même*. The book is brightly written in a popular style. The hand may be that of a Turk, but the voice sounds from the West. The writer starts by citing the acknowledgement of the authority of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures made more than once in the Koran, e.g. in ii ('The Cow') 130, 'We believe . . . that which hath been sent down unto us . . . and that which was delivered unto Moses, and Jesus. . . . We make no distinction between any of them'. He then cites against Islam many instances in which the Koran is at variance with the earlier sacred books; such instances can readily be found.

In chapter ii the author asks whether Mohammed uttered prophecies (he means *predictions*) and performed miracles. He quotes Koran viii ('The Spoils') 66, 'O Prophet, stir up the faithful to war: if twenty of you persevere, they shall overcome two hundred', &c. (Aarifi quotes an abbreviated text). 'Par Jupin fulminant! (he cries) que sont devenues ces pompeuses promesses? Pourquoi les célestes phalanges ne volèrent-elles à leur aide et secours à la bataille de Poitiers [A.D. 732], à celle de Lépante [A.D. 1571], à celle de Chozim [A.D. 1621], ou au siège de Vienne?!' Falsified prediction!

But Aarifi remembers that in Koran xxx ('Rūm') 1–3, the victory [of Heraclius] over the Persians [A.D. 622–627] is predicted. 'Rūm has been overcome in a neighbouring land, but they, after they have been overcome, shall overcome [in turn] within a few years'. Our author dismisses this prediction with a quotation from Cicero:

> Bene qui conjiciet, vatem hunc perhibebo optimum.

He then cites parallel instances of political prevision which no one presumably would call 'inspired'. 'Des esprits spéculatifs', when North America was first colonized, predicted that the colonies would in time establish an independent government. William Pitt foresaw that Bonaparte would fall and that the first push would be given by Spain. Bismarck once said, 'Il est possible que Dieu ait prévu pour l'Allemagne une nouvelle débâcle suivie d'un relèvement glorieux sous le régime républicain'. Again, Aarifi will not admit the claim made for the Koran of being composed with inspired eloquence. He quotes the verdicts of Sir Thomas Browne ('un livre mal composé'), Schopenhauer ('ce fichu livre'), de Vogüé ('Aucune suite dans tous ces fragments, aucun enchaînement, aucune harmonie'), and of other writers, Robert Burton, Goethe, T. Carlyle, Lord Avebury.

There are many passages of the Koran which lie open to objection, and such do not escape our author's notice. Thus in iv ('Women'), 156 answer is made to the claim of the Jews, 'Verily we slew the Messiah 'Isā (Jesus) the son of Maryam, the apostle of God'. In the Koran it is written, 'They neither slew him nor crucified him, but it was one who was made like him for them. . . . And they did not truly kill him, but God lifted him up to himself: and God is mighty and hath knowledge'. Aarifi rejoins that Christ rose from the dead and appeared to 500 persons, 'leur montra les stigmates et cicatrices des clous sur ses mains et ses pieds divins; et enfin . . . il monta triomphalement aux cieux en présence de ses disciples et en compagnie de saints anges, chérubins et séraphins'. If another was substituted for him on the cross it was another who ascended into heaven! Again xvii ('Night journey') begins with the words, 'Praise to Him who caused his servant to travel by night from the inviolable sanctuary (*masjid*, "mosque") to the most distant sanctuary (*masjid*)'. The modern Muslim identifies 'the most distant sanctuary' with the present *masjid al-Akṣā* in the Haram of Jerusalem, but this was not in existence in Mohammed's day. The *masjid* meant in the Koran is most probably the famous temple of Jerusalem which was destroyed five centuries before Mohammed. 'Par conséquent, ce qu'il nous conte de son voyage nocturne est encore une grosse imposture.'

Aarifi like other controversialists points out contradictions within the Koran. A striking instance is supplied by ii 59, 'Those who are Believers, and those who Judaize, and the Nazarenes, and the Sabeans, who believe in Allah and the Last Day, and deal uprightly, they have their reward with their Lord, and no dread rests upon them, neither have they sorrow'. In contrast to this Aarifi quotes iii ('The family of Imran') 79, 'As for the man who seeketh for any other religion than Islam, it shall not be accepted at his hands, and he in the life to come shall be of those who are lost'. Sale tells us that Mohammedan doctors disagree over the reconciliation of these two passages.

Of the morality (or immorality) of Islam, and particularly of polygamy, our author has much to say, nor does he spare the evil example of Mohammed himself. He quotes against the prophet the maxim, *Quidquid principes faciunt, praecipere videntur.* This last touch is not unfair.

Das zweite Buch der Machabäer, übersetzt und erklärt von Dr Constantin Gutberlet. (Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster i. W., 1927.)

This book is issued with *Imprimatur.* The commentary is somewhat fuller than that of Dr Moffatt in Canon Charles's *Apocrypha.* The writer is generally in favour of the historical character of 2 Maccabees, and endeavours to remove 'discrepancies' with 1 Maccabees. The two epistles prefixed to 2 Maccabees contain some strange statements, but on them Dr Gutberlet remarks, 'Die Wahrheit der Briefe brauchen wir nicht zu verteidigen, denn ihre Verfasser, auch das Synhedrium, waren nicht unfehlbar, und der inspirierte Verfasser hat sie nicht in allweg gutgeheissen, da er ihnen ja stellenweise widerspricht'. On xii 43–45 (the offering of Maccabaeus for the slain) he quotes Luther, 'Judas tut das nicht aus einem Gebot, sondern aus einem Gutdünken. . . . Was geht mich aber sein Gutdünken an?' To this the Commentator replies, 'Das Gutdünken eines so hervorragenden Glaubensstreiters hat mehr Gewicht für uns als die Meinung Luthers.' On xv 12–16 he remarks, 'Unsere Stelle liefert ein schönes Zeugnis für die Anrufung der Heiligen.' But such excursions into controversy are happily rare. Dr Gutberlet has studied his text carefully. He refers constantly to the Vulgate, and now and again the Latin preserves a better text than the Codex Alexandrinus: vi 1, *senem quemdam Antiochenum*: γέροντα Ἀθηναῖον, A; xi 15, *rex*: γραμματεύς, A; xiv 13, *datis mandatis*: δοὺς ἐπιστολάς, A. The notes on subject-matter are generally helpful. Some misprints in the Greek text of the book need correction, e.g. ii 17, 32; xii 45. In xi 9 σιδηρᾶ should not be rendered by 'eherne'.

The permanent value of the Ten Commandments, by H. J. FLOWERS, B.A., B.D. (George Allen, London [1927].)

'THIS book', says the author, 'sprang out of sermons, addresses, and lectures delivered to ordinary congregations.' The work is 'popular' in the good sense of the epithet. The style is colloquial, but often forcible. There is knowledge and thought behind these 'sermons'. The ethical teaching is on a high level.

As a specimen of Mr Flowers's treatment we may quote a passage from the chapter on the Eighth Commandment. After discussing the nature of the institution of private property he calls our attention to a law which a Communist might welcome. A 'prophetic contribution', he writes, 'to Hebrew legislation was the Law concerning the Year of Jubile. It was decreed that every fifty years Jewish society should be broken up into its primitive elements. . . . All land was to be returned to its original owners, thereby bringing back the old custom which made land an inalienable possession. All slaves were to be given their freedom, all debts were to be cancelled, and the land was to lie fallow for a year. . . . It may have been an impracticable law. . . . It was never intended to be put into practice. It was, like the

Messianic Age, the dream of the prophet, always an inspiration, but never realizable as fact. But what keeps the world going is the impossible dream of the seer.'

In characterizing this law as a prophetic contribution to Hebrew legislation Mr Flowers can hardly be in the right. The passage containing it (Lev. xxv) belongs to the so-called *Heiligkeitsgesetz* (Lev. xix–xxvi) which has indeed points of contact with Ezekiel the priest-prophet, but cannot be called characteristically prophetic. Further, was the Law of Jubile wholly impracticable? It absorbed the law of the sacredness of the seventh year, which history tells was in fact observed. Dr Driver writes (*Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 57, ninth edition), 'It is impossible to think that (as has sometimes been supposed) the institution of the Jubile is a mere paper-law—a theoretical completion of the system of seven; at least so far as concerns the *land* (for the periodical redistribution of which there are analogies in other nations) it must date from ancient times in Israel'.

Die Peschitta des Alten Testamentes, by Dr Phil. et Theol. LEO HAEFELI. (Münster i. W., 1927, Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung.)

THIS compendium of 120 pages forms a valuable introduction to the study of the Peshitta of the Old Testament. It is especially strong on the side of Bibliography. After a brief general introduction Dr Haefeli proceeds to give estimates of the character of the Peshitta in different parts of the Old Testament. For the Pentateuch he cites pretty fully the views of L. Hirzel in his brochure, *De Pentateuchi Versionis Syriacae indole*, Lipsiae, 1825, still a valuable work. Hermann Mager has written on Joshua (Freiburg, 1916), and S. Fränkel on Chronicles, which he maintains is a Jewish Targum. E. Baumann in *ZAW.* xvii and xix discusses fully the character of the translation of Job, and comes to the conclusion, 'Die lebendige konkrete Ausdrucksweise des Originals ist im Syrer abgeblasst, verwaschen und verallgemeinert'. On the rendering of the Psalms several dissertations have been written, e.g. by F. Baethgen (1878, 1882), J. F. Berg (New York, 1895), B. Oppenheim (Leipzig, 1891). All work of this kind has been now made easier by the *Syrisch-hebräisches Glossar zu den Psalmen* by E. Techen in *ZAW.* xvii (1897, *not* '1879'). Dr Haefeli continues his notices to cover practically the whole of the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha.

An account follows of the printed texts of the Old Testament and of parts thereof. Next come notices of the chief MSS, beginning with

B.M. Add. 14425, the dated Pentateuch (A.D. 464). Four pages are devoted to the Pandect in the Ambrosian Library, and two to the interesting Florentine MS, 'Or 58'. Nestorian MSS and Masoretic MSS are also recorded. For any one who desires to give serious study to the Peshitta Dr Haefeli's brochure is indispensable.

Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, edited by JOHANNES HEMPEL. N. F. iv. (A. Töpelmann, Giessen, 1927.)

THIS volume begins appropriately with *In memoriam* notices of Hugo Gressmann, who succeeding Karl Marti as editor brought out volumes i–iii (1924–1926) of the new series. Gressmann's services to Old Testament science were great. He was only 50 when he died.

The *Zeitschrift* keeps up its high standard under its new editor. S. Mowinckel has an article of twenty-nine pages on the Last Words of David (2 Sam. xxiii 1–7). He offers a bold reconstruction of the text, chiefly through additions of words which he supposes have fallen out. He remarks that scholars are ready enough to detect 'Glosses', 'Doublettes', 'Interpolations', but they are slow to see that the traditional text 'voll von Lakunen ist'. So Mowinckel reconstructs *vv.* 4 *b*, 5 *a* boldly as a stanza of four lines:

As herbage springs forth after rain,
  And grass shoots forth from the earth,
Such is my state with Jahwe,
  Such is the state of my house with God.

The negative of *v.* 5 *a* (M.T.), 'Verily my house is not so with God' simply disappears.

The Passover has elicited two communications, one from Professor Adam C. Welch ('the question of the place where *pesach* was celebrated, at the sanctuary or in the home') and one in two parts from Professor N. M. Nicolsky of Minsk, U.S.S.R., 'Pascha im Kulte des jerusalemischen Tempels'. Nicolsky's conclusion is, 'Somit illustriert das Schicksal des Pascha nach seiner Einverleibung in den Tempelkult glänzend Wellhausens treffenden Ausspruch, dass der Tempelkult der Gemeinde des zweiten Tempels ein Kult war, in welchem die Natur ertötet war'.

Two interesting articles deal with Aramaic. W. Baumgartner has a treatise of fifty pages entitled *Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel.* He points out how much more is known now of the older Aramaic than in the days when scholars (cf. S. R. Driver *L. O. T.*^{9} pp. 502–504) were arguing for the late date of the Aramaic of Daniel from its resemblance to the (confessedly) late Aramaic of the Targums. Recent discoveries have given us documents in Aramaic dating from the eighth, seventh, sixth, and fifth centuries B.C. We can now compare Biblical Aramaic with Aramaic known to be as old as the reputed date of Daniel the prophet. One mark of the comparative lateness of Biblical Aramaic is its consistent writing of ד (not ז) in such words as דהב, דבח, בדר. In the Zinjirli inscriptions (eighth century B.C.) ז is regularly used, in those of Elephantine (fifth century B.C.) it is sometimes ז and sometimes ד. The consistent use of ד in B A looks like a third and later stage in spelling.

B A seems also to have the later spelling where the variation is between ע and ק. The Zinjirli inscriptions have ארקא, מוקא, ירקי ('er habe Wohlgefallen'). So the Elephantine papyri have קמר ('Wolle'). But Daniel and Ezra consistently display ע: we find אע, ארע, and עלע.

In his conclusion Baumgartner allows a range of date to the language from the second to the third century B.C., while the subject-matter of Daniel reaches back 'into the Persian period'. On the question whether the language is Eastern ('Babylonian') or Western Aramaic (Syrian or Egyptian) Baumgartner will not give a decision. 'Judging from the material which lies before us we are not in a position to distinguish between Eastern and Western for the period to which Daniel belongs.'

A contribution on an allied subject is A. Sperber, *Zur Sprache des Prophetentargums*. He concludes his article with the text of the Targum on 1 Kings xvii–xix printed from the British Museum MS 'Or 2210' with a short apparatus added. The supralinear vocalization is given. The text thus differs throughout from Lagarde's which is printed from cod. Reuchlin written in A.D. 1105, without points, but furnished with many *matres lectionis*. Here and there some more important variations appear. Thus 1 Kings xvii 20 (M.T.) is, 'O JEHOVAH, my God, hast thou brought evil even upon the widow with whom I sojourn by slaying her son?' Lagarde, 'O Jehovah my God, have mercy even (האף) on this widow with whom I dwell: let not evil happen unto her: let not her son (ית ברה sic!) die'. Sperber, 'Verily (ברם) as concerning the widow with whom I dwell, let not evil happen unto her, and let not her son (ברה tantum) die'. Lagarde's text with its literal האף for הגם and its literal and ungrammatical ית ברה for את בנה is probably the earlier form. The particle ית is no doubt retained in order that it may be given a midrashic interpretation.

The variations in the MSS of the Targum affect the sense seriously only rarely, but many of them are interesting. A great number are cases in which one reading renders the Hebrew word by an Aramaic form of the root which is common to Hebrew and Aramaic, while the other gives a purely Aramaic equivalent. A simple instance is found in Judges viii 10, חרב [שולף] M.T., where cod. Reuchlin has סייפא, and other authorities חרבא.

The volume concludes with full notices of the contents of Theological and Oriental Journals in English, German, Dutch, French, and Italian. The contents of six Jewish Journals are also recorded.

In the *Revue des Études juives* lxxxiii 184–206, F. Nau publishes *Deux épisodes d'histoire juive sous Théodose II* (423–438) from an unpublished biography of the Syrian Archimandrite Barsumes (Barsauma) who in his second journey through Palestine destroyed the temples and the synagogues. In 423 a law protecting synagogues was enacted. Later a rebuilding of the Temple was planned. In 438 Barsauma plotted a movement ('einen Aufstand') against the Jews. (In 439 anti-Jewish laws were passed.)

W. EMERY BARNES.

Jezus, Paulus & Rome, by Prof. Dr J. DE ZWAAN. (H. J. Paris, Amsterdam, 1927.)

Two main ideas appear to have dominated Prof. Zwaan's mind in writing this book.

In the first place it is a protest against the tendency, taken over from the Natural Sciences, to suppose that an organization is explained when it has been reduced to its constituent atoms. An oak is not merely a collection of wood and a dozen other materials. There is something which unites them and makes them an oak. The same is true of Christendom and Christianity, only here we substitute Some one for something. Wherever the spirit of Christ is operative, there we have Christianity and Christendom.

The second main position of Dr Zwaan is that Christianity is based on truths intuitively appreciated and not on a code of external rules.

The Dutch Professor begins his discussion with the teaching of our Lord. Here there is the necessity of detaching the colouring given to the words of Christ by the Evangelists. In addition our Lord Himself must have accommodated His teaching to the limitations of His hearers and the circumstances of His age. Fortunately we have an easy test by which to separate what is vital and eternal in the teaching of Christ from what was temporary and local. It was the promise of Jeremiah that in the time of the Messiah God would write His law in men's hearts. Anything in our Lord's doctrine which is part of a code of morality imposed from without is no essential part of His teaching.

Already in Heb. viii 10 we find the beginning of a departure from what is ethical and intuitive to what is intellectual and moralistic.

The section on Calvin is mainly an attack on the Calvinism prevalent in Reformed Churches on the Continent. The God of Calvin is a different Person from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Swiss reformer has got his views of God from his conception of what is involved in the term 'Almighty' and not from the Bible. For this reason his position agrees with that of Mohammed. The teaching of Calvin is more in accord with the spirit of primitive religions than with that of Christ. It did not come within the scope of Dr Zwaan's treatise to consider whether there was anything in St Paul's earlier training or present circumstances to explain the position he adopted in the Epistle to the Romans. Similarly, in criticizing Calvin he does not discuss the influence exercised by Augustine on Western thought generally and on the Reformers in particular.

With Rome we come to the circumference of the circle. Dr Zwaan first discusses the teaching of Seneca as a good example of pure, heathen morality, and shews the difference between his doctrine and Christianity. For English readers nothing is added in this section to the work of Lightfoot.

We next come to Hermas, who may be regarded as a typical Roman Christian of the second century. Already in him we recognize the tendency of the Roman Church to substitute external law for intuitive knowledge of the truth.

The last section of the book deals with the worship of the Emperor. This has left a deep and abiding influence on the Christian Church. In the decrees of Councils we find the Imperial rescripts for the regulation of religion under another name. The Reformation got rid of many heathen ideas derived from the practice of Emperor-worship, but much still remains to be done.

H. H. B. AYLES.

RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

(1) ENGLISH.

The Church Quarterly Review, January 1928 (Vol. cv, No. 210: S.P.C.K.). W. K. FIRMINGER The Indian Church Measure—E. O. JAMES Magic and the sacramental principle—E. W. WATSON An eighteenth-century clergyman—E. LYTTELTON Questions for modernists—H. N. BATE A Pauline problem—Music and singing in village churches—A. LEHTONEN Finland—THE EDITOR An explanation—A. E. TURNER Sin and psychology—H. J. L. ROBBIE George Herbert—W. K. L. CLARKE Some old books—Reviews—Short Notices.

The Hibbert Journal, January 1928 (Vol. xxvi, No. 2: Constable & Co.). VISCOUNT HALDANE The Churches and higher education—H. HANDLEY Decline in the ministry of the Church of England—T. J. HARDY A Catholic without a Church—H. A. GARNETT The Prayer Book and the Holy Communion—H. BROWN Wanted–theology of positive vision—M. Loisy on Dr Strömholm's thesis—D. STRÖMHOLM A literary examination of Mark—N. F. ČAPEK The religious situation in Czechoslovakia—M. B. WHITING Bishop Ken and the ladies of Naish Court—J. M. THOMPSON An atheist curé of the eighteenth century—M. KENT John Woolman: mystic and reformer—G. N. CLARK The causes of War—W. M. FARQUHAR Caesar, the British Empire and the League of Nations—T. W. MITCHELL The phenomena of mediumistic trance—C. C. J. WEBB Shakespeare and Religion—Survey and Signed Reviews.

(2) AMERICAN.

The Harvard Theological Review, January 1928 (Vol. xxi, No. 1: Harvard University Press). The Serabît Inscriptions: I K. LAKE and R. P. BLAKE The rediscovery of the Inscriptions—II R. F. BUTIN The decipherment and significance of the Inscriptions—J. H. ROPES and W. H. P. HATCH The Vulgate, Peshitto, Sahidic, and Bohairic Versions of Acts and the Greek Manuscripts—R. P. CASEY The text of the Anti-manichaean writings of Titus of Bostra and Serapion of Thmuis.

(3) BELGIAN.

Revue Bénédictine, October 1927 (Vol. xxxix, No. 4: Abbaye de Maredsous). G. MORIN Trois manuscrits d'Engelberg à l'Ambrosiana—A. WILMART *L'Oratio sancti Ambrosii* du missel romain—U. BERLIÈRE L'exercice du ministère paroissial par les moines du XII^{e} au XVIII^{e}

siècle—B. CAPELLE Le rescrit d'Hadrien et S. Justin—H. PLENKERS L'édition de la Règle bénédictine par Baudoin Moreau—Comptes rendus—B. CAPELLE Bulletin d'ancienne littérature chrétienne latine—P. SCHMITZ Bulletin d'histoire bénédictine.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, January 1928 (Vol. xxiv, No. 1: Louvain, 40 Rue de Namur). J. DUHR Le *De Fide* de Bachiarius—P. GALTIER *Ecclesia Petri propinqua*: A propos de Tertullien et Calliste—R. DRAGUET Le florilège antichalcédonien du *Vatic. Graec.* 1431—A. DE POORTER Catalogue des mss. de prédication médiévale de la bibliothèque de Bruges—Comptes rendus—Chronique—Bibliographie.

(4) GERMAN.

Theologische Quartalschrift (Vol. cviii, No. 4: H. Laupp, Tübingen). A. ANWANDER Die Alexandrinische Katechetenschule und Indien—P BROWE Die Aufopferung der Kommunion im Mittelalter—J. B. SÄGMÜLLER Die Identität von Konkordat und Konvention zwischen dem Apostolischen Stuhl und dem Staat—Besprechungen.

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

JULY, 1928

DOCUMENTS

FRAGMENTS OF AN EIGHTH-CENTURY GALLICAN SACRAMENTARY.

I. *Palaeographical Description.*

Two sheets of vellum measuring *ca.* 335 × 260 mm., which appear to have been used as covers for the boards of a book or as part of a binding, are now in the private collection of Mr Wilfred Merton, at Slindon, where they have the press-mark Slindon W. Merton MS. 21. They are the remains of two bifolia; each leaf originally measured about 215 × 260 mm., the written space is 215 × 165 mm., the text is in two columns, each 77 mm. wide, single bounding lines enclose each column, the ruling is on the hair-side. It is fairly certain that the two pairs come from one quire. They are not adjacent, the second pair was in the middle of a quire (ff. iv–v), the others were probably ff. ii and vii if the quire was arranged normally with flesh-side to flesh-side.

The script is uncial, but formulas 5, 6, and 7 on fol. 2^r are in Pre-caroline minuscule. Dr Lowe has been good enough to give his opinion on the palaeography of the fragment. The uncial recalls at first sight the type found in the Gallicanum Vetus, Vatic. Pal. Lat. 493, hand of foll. 19–96 (s. viii); but closer inspection does not confirm this impression. It is certainly Frankish, and not from south or west; its home cannot be more definitely fixed. The middle of the eighth century is the probable date, probably later than the Gothicum and later than the first and second hands of the Gallicanum Vetus. The minuscule also suggests north or north-east France and a date after rather than before A.D. 750. The use of two columns is another indication of a date somewhat after the middle of the century.

The ornamentation is simple: the Contestatio 'Vere Dignum' has only a very plain initial V. In the two examples of 'Exaudi' the initial E has the fish-motif and a second initial X written inside. Three times D has the round uncial shape formed out of a curved fish, twice there is a large capital D. S is a very large initial formed out of the body of a fish, initial I is quite plain. The colours used are red and green.

Abbreviations are few and in no way remarkable. Nomina Sacra are regular, FRA KMI or FRS KM = Fratres carissimi; OMNP, omnps = omnipotens; SEMPT = sempiterne; CONTEST = contestatio; MISS = missa; COLL = collectio; IT = item; BENED = Benedictio; QS = quaesumus; PRES = praesta; IPS = ipse; QUE is abbreviated by Q: in the uncial and by q; in the minuscule. The scribe abbreviates M by a *suprascript* stroke even in the middle of a line and the middle of a word SOLLĒNITATE. There is a good deal of punctuation, clauses are divided by a single point on the level of the middle of the letters.

II. *Analysis of the contents.*

The leaves contain parts of a Sacramentary of the 'Gallican' type, that is to say the Mass begins either with the Collectio post precem followed by the Praefatio Missae or immediately with the Praefatio Missae. The manuscript which they most closely resemble is the Missale Gothicum, Rome Vat. Regin. 317. Indeed the same materials have been used in both to a large extent.

There does not, however, seem to be any direct relation between the two manuscripts. This book is simply another example of the Romanized Gallican liturgy of which the Gothicum is a type.

The surviving masses appear to be parts of a mass for Sunday, the Mass for the Nativity of St John Baptist, and the Mass for SS. Peter and Paul. It is probable that the last two masses were together in the Sacramentary. For convenience of reference I have attached a number to each of the formulae.

Fol 1^r is complete but practically illegible; it contains the end of a mass all in uncial. The last line had contained a title of which nothing survives; probably something like ITEM MISSA DOMINICALIS.

Fol. 1^v.

1. A collect without a title but clearly a Collectio post precem.
2. 'PRAEFACIO MISS.'
3. 'IT COLL' of which eleven lines survive.

This is part of the third Sunday Mass in the Missale Gothicum.

Foll. 2^r–3^v.

4. Five lines of a collect Post Orationem Dominicam.
5. 'BENED POPULI' the text being in minuscule.
6. A collect with a rubric of which only 'co' is legible, also in minuscule.
7. Another collect probably Consummatio Missae, also in minuscule.

This is no doubt part of the same mass, and the missing leaf would contain two collects, the Contestatio, and two (or three) other collects. Formula [4] is found almost identically in the Sacramentarium Leonianum. Formula [5] is found elsewhere in a collection of Sunday Benedictions. Formula [6] comes from the fifth Sunday Mass in the Missale Gothicum, [7] from the fourth Sunday Mass.

Here follows the Mass for the Nativity of St John Baptist.

8. The Praefatio with no rubric.
9. 'COLL EIUSDEM'
10. Another collect, rubric illegible, probably 'POST NOMINA'.
11. Another collect which seems to be 'COLL AD PACEM'.
12. 'CONTEST' of which twelve lines survive.

Here the leaf ends. The missing leaf could complete the Mass and contain the first part of the Mass for SS. Peter and Paul.

Fol. 4r.

13. Seven lines of a collect, probably Post Nomina for SS. Peter and Paul.
14. 'COLL AD PACEM.'
15. Apparently a collect beginning with an initial D; we should expect a contestatio here. Only a narrow strip survives. The verso is hardly legible, but the second column seems to contain the contestatio of the Mass.

Special thanks are due to the owner of the leaves for kindly making them available for publication and to Dr Lowe and Dom André Wilmart for help and suggestions.

III. *Transcription of the fragments.*

Fol. 1r seems to begin col. 1 TOR . . . PROPITIUS a good many letters are visible here and there. It ends . . . NOBIS P on col. 2 line 23. The rubric which must have occupied line 24 is not legible.

fol. 1^{v}

[1] EXAUD^{i} SUPPLICA
TIONES FAMILI
AE TUAE OMNI̅P̅ D̅S̅
ET DIRECTAS IN CONS
PECTU TUO CONFI
TENTIŪ PRECCES
QU ASI ODORĒ IN
CENSI BENE FLAGRAN
TES ADSUME Ꝑ

[2] S PRAEFACIO MIS̅S̅
EMPITERNAM
DN̅I̅ MAIESTATĒ
F̅R̅A̅ KM̅I̅ DE
PRECEMUR UT
SC̅A̅M PER TOTIUS
ORBIS SPATIA TUE
ATUR ECLESIAM
CONUERSATIONE
SACERDOTIB: CON
CEDAT HONESTAM
UITAM FIDELIB:
TRIBUAT SEMPITER
NAM·UIRGINIBUS
UIDUIS QUAE OR
FANIS ET PAENITEN
TIBUS·UEL IN QUIB:
CUMQ: NECESSITA
TEB: CONSTITUTIS · O
PORTUNA PRAESIDI
A LARGIATUR AC SIBI
PLACITA CONCEDAT ·
IN PEREGRINATIONE
BUS ETIAM SOLACIŪ ·
IN DOLORIBUS ME
DICAMENTŪ IN LABO
RIB: PRESTET AUXI
LIUM Ꝑ IT COLL

[3] D S̅ QUI DIUES ES AD
IGNOSCENDŪ ET
PROPTERIA UOLU
ISTI CARNIS HUMILI
TATEM ADSUMIRE
UT NOBIS HUMILITA
TIS EXEMPLA RELIN
QUERIS · ET IN QUIB:
CUMQ: PASSIONIB:
FACIRIS ESSE CONS
TANTES PRAESTA Q̅S̅

Formula [1]. For this collect compare Missale Gothicum, Vat. Reg. 317, Muratori, *Liturgia Romana Vetus*, Venice 1748, vol. II col. 650, ed. H. M. Bannister, Henry Bradshaw Society, 1917–1919, No. 501, where similar phrases occur, and also Missale Gallicanum Vetus, Vat. Palat. 493, Muratori II col. 758. Migne *P. L.* 72 col. 381 'Suscipe preces populi tui, clementissime Deus, et directas in spiritu tuo oblationes quasi odorem incensi flagrantis adsume' where spiritu is clearly an error for conspectu. This is a collect for a Missa in Rogationibus. Col. 1, line 1 i *suprascript*; line 7 QUIA SI *prima manu*; line 9 TES *add. secunda manus.*

Formula [2] is No. 499 in the Missale Gothicum, Muratori II col. 649–650. Bannister gives no other reference. Col. 1, line 12 dei Goth.; line 16 s *secunda manu*; line 18 conuersationem Goth.; line 21 populis Goth.; line 22 *lege* TRIBUAT; line 24 quae *om.* Goth. A *corrector expunxit*; col. 2, line 1 ac Goth.; line 6 tribuat et *loco* largiatur ac Goth.; line 7 placita uota Goth.; line 9 peregrinacionibus praemia i. d. medicamenta Goth.

Formula [3] is in the Missale Gothicum No. 500, Muratori II col. 650 and see Plate XLIII in Chatelain *Uncialis Scriptura*, Paris 1901. Col. 2, line 23 nos facires esse Goth.; line 24 quaesumus *om.* Goth.

fol. 2r

[4] FUTUṚIS PROPITIUSQ:
CONCEDE UT QUE NOḄ
IS POSCIMUS REḶẠ
XARI IPSI QUOQ: PRO
XIMIS REMITTAMUS P
BENE̅D̅ POPULI ∻

[5] Benedic dn̄e populum tuum
et deuotum respice pa
riter humilitatem, uide gẹ
mitos suscipe dolentes pater
na pietate iube consolare ✠
prostratum alleba disper
sum congrega · adunatumq
conserua esurientem ciba
sitientē pota omnesq simul
coelestibus donis inriga ✠
Dele in eis omnem peccati
maculam et te gubernante
ad gloriam perueniant
sempiternam ✠ Humiliata ti
bi omnium capita dexterae
tuae benedictione sc̄ifica
ac benedicendo peccata re
laxa sc̄iq sp̄s infunde caris

[mata ut sine ulla offen
sione maiestatis tuae prae
cepta adimpleant et ad
uitam aeternam te auxi]
liante perueniant . . . . . .
COLL P . . . .

[6] Diuinam misericord
iam fr̄s km̄ concord
di oratione poscamus u[ti
haec salutifera sacra
menta nostris recepta u[is
ceribus purificent ani
mam corpusq sc̄ificent
atque ịṇ spem caelestis . . . .
. . . uiscera pariter et cor
da confirment. COLḶ

[7] Exaudi preces familiae tu[ae
omnip̄s semp̄t ds̄ et pres
ta ut scā hec quae te do
nante sumpsimus incor
rupta in nobis te auxilian[te
s[eruemus
MI̅S̅S̅ IN NATIUI
TATE SC̄I IOHANNIS BAP[T

Formula [4] is part of a Post Orationem Dominicam. It is found almost identically in the Leonine Sacramentary, Muratori I col. 359 'Libera nos ab omni malo propitiusque concede ut quae nobis poscimus relaxari ipsi quoque proximis remittamus. Per'. It is found also (as a post communio) in one of the last masses of the Gelasianum (Muratori I col. 705) Orationes pro caritate 'Libera nos domine ab omni malo etc.' Cf. Missale Gothicum, No. 529, Muratori II col. 654 where the beginning of the prayer is similar.

Formula [5] is found in Paris B. N. lat. 819, the Sacramentary of Angoulême, published by Dom Cagin, Angoulême, 1919, Formula 1870; it is one of the many Benedictiones dominicales. Col. 1, line 8 pater Angoulême, line 9 gemitus Angoulême, possibly gemitos here, but the first two letters are doubtful; line 11 Angoulême has apparently a cross only once, namely after consolare; col. 2, lines 1–4 are here illegible, the text comes from Angoulême.

Formula [6] is in the Missale Gothicum, No. 530, Muratori II col. 655 post-communion for missa dominicalis V and also No. 92, Muratori II col. 545 Post Eucharistiam for Epiphany where pectoribus is read instead of visceribus.

Col. 2, line 9 frs km *om.* Goth.; line 13 either ad or in is possible; spem caelestium uiscera Goth.; here possibly the word is praemii or gratiae after caelestis.

Formula [7] is in Missale Gothicum, No. 520, Muratori II col. 653 consummatio missae of missa dominicalis IV. Col. 2, line 18 sempiterne *om.* Goth.

fol. 2$^{\mathrm{v}}$

[8] INTER DIUINAS LAU
DES ET NOSTRAS
PRECES FR̄S K̄M
INTEREST HODIE
BEATISSIMI IO
HANNIS PRAESTAN
TESSIMA IN GAUDI
I]S POPULORŪ NATA
NATIUITAS IN QUA
NOBIS MULTIPLI
CIS GRATIAE DONA
UENERANTIB: DŪ
IN PRAECONIO UO
CATUR ILLE QUI
PRESTITIT IN SUF
FRAGIO QUAERI
TUR ILLE QUI NO
BIS AUCTOREM UI
TAE NEC DUM NATUS
OSTENDIT UT EXPRES
UITAE SUAE TESTIS
FIERIT UITAE NOS
TRAE HIC PRO
PHETAT IN SPŪ TES

TIFICATUR IN EUANGE
LIO MINISTRAT IN
BAPTISMO · DOCET
IN POPULO · DEGET
IN HERIMO · PROFE
CIT IN DESERTO · PA
RAT UIAE UIĀ UENTU
RUM NUNTIAT PER
QUĒ UENIT · IN HUIUS
ERGO NATALITIAE DI
EI SOLLĒNITATE GAU
DENTES PACIFICAS
SACRIFICIORŪ HOS
TIAS IMMOLEMUS
UT SACERDOTALIS OF
FICII FUNCTIONEM
SC̄I ANGELI UISITATI
ONE DIGNATUS FACI
AT PROMISSA NOS
CREDIRE CREDITA
PRAEDICARE PRAE
DICATA NON PERDI
RE QUOD IPS PRĒST
COL̄L EIUSDEM

The greater part of [8] is to be found in the Mozarabic Sacramentaries, Toledo Cabild. 35. 3, fol. 162, col. 2 and fol. 164, col. 1. London B. Mus. Add. 30845, fol. 22 r and Toledo Cabild. 35. 6. See Ferotin *Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum*, Paris 1912, cols. 349–351, formulas 804 and 807. There are considerable variants. Column 1, lines 1–23 are in a similar place in the Mozarabic Mass; lines 23–column 2, line 9 are part of the Mozarabic Inlatio.

Column 1, line 1. Inter laudes tuas et preces nostras omnipotens deus interest etc. Tolet.; line 8 ordinata Tolet.; line 11 gratiae tuae Tolet.; line 13 praeconium Tolet.; line 17 there is an omission here of qui meruit. The Toledo MS. has 'queritur ille qui meruit. Qui nobis' etc.; line 18 nobis naturarum omnium creatorem Tolet.; line 20 *lege* expers; line 21 suae fieret testis gloriae tuae Tolet.; line 23 Hic *om.* Tolet.; line 24 s *secunda manu.* Column 2, line 1 testificat Tolet.

fol. 3r

[9] DN̄Ē D̄S̄ NOSTER QUI
AD TESTIMONIUM
SC̄Ī IOHANNIS BAPTIS
TE AC PRAEUÌI TUI ET
IAM ORTUS EIUS DI
EM ECLESIIS CONSE
C̄RASTI UT ÇUM OM
NES SCŌS̄ TUOS EGRE
DIENTES EX HOC MUN
DO SOLLEMNI PERCU
LAT UOTO HUNC SO
LUM ETIAM INGRE
DIENTEM IN HUNC
MUNDUM CELEBRI
OCCURRAT OFFICIO
QUIA SCILICET ET CON
CEPTUS EIUS ORACU
LUM EST ET NATIUI
TAS GAUDIUM · ET
PRAEDICATIO SACRA
MENTUM ET MORS
IPSA MARTYRIŪ QUI
UNICUM TUUM DN̄M
NOSTRUM ET CLAU
SUS MATERN[IS UIS
CERIB: IND[ICAUIT
ET EDITUS O[STEN
DIT ET MOR [ITURUS
N(UN)TIAUIT [INFUN
DE Q̄S̄ HIS SO[LLEM
NITATIB: NO[UAM
UISITATION[Ē GRA
TIAE TUAE U[T NOS
QUOQ: DŪ G[
CARI TIBI IN [SC̄ŌRŪ
TUORŪ LAUD[Ē SUSCI
P̣IMUS UIĀ [TUAM
IN NOSTRIS C[ORDIB:
PRAEPARE [
QUAE TE NU[NC NATI
UITATE SU[P̣
AE TU MEN[ṬIŪ DE
FENDAT SE[MPER
PURITATĒ S[
ONEM TUI I[
SUS OBTEN[EAT
ꝑ XP̄M̄ DN̄[M . .

Formula [9] is to be compared with some of the phraseology of the Breviarium Gothicum, Madrid, 1775, p. ccxlix, Migne *P. L.* 86, col. 1134 ‘cujus conceptus miraculum cujus nativitas gaudium approbatur’. Cf. col. 1, lines 16–19. But I have not identified this formula.

fol. 3^{v}

[10] . . . .
. . . .
. . . . OL . . . .
IOHAN⟨NI⟩S BAP
TISTAE]NATIUITATEM
]TI . . RESPICE
PROP]ITIUS AD AN
NUA SOL]LEMNIA PRE
CURS]ORIS UT SACRI
FICIU]M QUOD NATA
LIS E]IUS MUNERE
GRAT]ỤLANTES OFFE
RIMU]S ET INDUL
GENTI]AM NOBIS OP
TINEA]T ET FAUORE P
. . . .

[11] DS Q]UI HUNC DIĒ
P]RAECONIS TUI
HONO]RABILEM NO
BIS I]Ṇ IOHANNIS
NATIU]ITATE FECIS
TI UT] GRATIAE TU
AE OP]ERANTE UIR
TUTE]M PRAECUR

SOR TU . . . . Ṇ . . . . .
ṬUR DA POPULO TUO
SCIENTIĀ SP̄ITALIUM
GAUDIORŪ ET OMNI
UM FIDILIŪ MENTES
DIRIGE IN UIA SALUTIS
ET PACES UT QUAE MA
NIFESTAUIT TESTIFI
CIO NUNTII IMPLE
AT PRAESENTIA NUN
TIATI QUOD IP̄S PRĒS

CONTEST̄
[12] VERE DIGNŪ ET
IUSTŪ EST AEQUŪ ET
SALUTARE EST NOS TI
BI GRATIAS AGERE DN̄E
SC̄E PATER OMN̄PS
AETERNE D̄S IN DIE
FESTIUITATIS HODI
ERNE IN QUA BEATUS
IOHANNIS EXORTUS
EST QUI UOCĒ MA
TRIS DN̄I NONDUM
EDITUS SENSIT ET AD

Formula [10] I have not identified.

Formula [11]. The same material has been used rather clumsily in the Missale Gothicum, No. 372, Muratori II col. 621 in the Immolatio Missae on which see Bannister's note. Compare also the Sacramentarium Leonianum, Muratori I col. 326. Part of it is also in the Breviarium Gothicum, Madrid, 1775, p. ccli, Migne *P. L.* 86, col. 1139. Col. 2, lines 2–7 occur as a collect in very many liturgical books. See references in Bannister. The Missale Gothicum has it as a collect, No. 371, Muratori II col. 621, as well as in the Immolatio Missae, which has 'qui praesentem diem honorabilem nobis in beati Iohannis nativitate fecisti ut gratiae tuae operante virtute ille quo inter natos mulierum nullus major oriretur. Da populis tuis eruditionem spiritalium gaudiorum et omnium fidelium mentes dirige in viam salutis et pacis ut quem manifestavit testificio nuntii impleat praesentia nuntiati'.

Formula [12] is found in the Leonine Sacramentary, Muratori I col. 327, ed. Feltoe, p. 32; in the St. Gall. MS. 348, ed. Dom. C. Mohlberg, Münster, 1918, No. 931; in the Angoulême Sacramentary, ed. Cagin, No. 1036; and in the Bobbio Missal, Muratori II col. 878; ed. E. A. Lowe, H. Bradshaw Society, 1920, No. 321, where references are given.

fol. 4ʳ

[13] BITACULO TUO ET
QUI SCORŪ MORTIB:
CAUSAS LAETITIAE
UNIUERSIS TRIBUES
INTERCESSU EORŪ
SPEM CUNCTIS UENI
AE LARGIARIS Ꝑ
[14] DS COLL AD PACĒ
QUI ECLESIȦM
TUAM APOSTOLI
TUI PETRI FIDEM
ET NOMINE CONSA
CRASTI QUIQ: BEATŪ
ILLI PAULŪ AD PRAE
DICANDĀ GENTIB: GLO
RIAM TUAM SOCIARE
DIGNATUS ES CONCE
DE UT OMNES QUI AD
EORUM SOLLEMNIA
CONUENERUNT SP̄I
TALI REMUNERATIO
NE DITENTUR IPSO
RŪ ETIĀ PRAECIB:
PLEBIS TUAE DONA

SC̄ĪF[ICA
BIT[
INS[Ṭ
RAP[
NIO[
[15] D
TER[
GRA[
INE[
SAU[
CUL[
COI[
FUL[
RAN[
GRO[
TER[
LIS[
NIS[
TEA[
RIA[
TER[
UIU[

Formula [13] I have not identified.

Formula [14] as far as line 22 'ditentur' is to be found often, e.g. in the Gregorian Sacramentary 'Ad vigilias in nocte' Muratori, II, col. 102; ed. H. A. Wilson, Henry Bradshaw Society, 1915, p. 87; in the Sacramentary of Bergamo, No. 980; and in the Sacramentary of Angoulême No. 1077.

Formula [15] appears to be another collect though we should expect a contestatio here. I have not identified it.

fol. 4ᵛ.

Column 1 is nearly all cut away; two or three letters at the ends of the last ten lines are decipherable. Col. 2 begins . . . HAEC SUNT | DŬO FLUMINA AR . . . | TA. This is probably from the contestatio for the Mass of SS. Peter and Paul, but I have not identified it.

WILLIAM JAMES ANDERSON.

NOTES AND STUDIES

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(*continued*).

X. *Usage of Mark*: (1) *Titles of address to Christ*; (2) *Diminutives*; (3) *The verb at the end of the sentence*; (4) *ἵνα not of purpose only*; (5) *absence of λέγων (λέγοντες) before a statement or question, where the main verb seems sufficient to imply it.*

As this series of notes draws to a close, each separate instalment becomes, almost inevitably, more miscellaneous in character. As some feature of St Mark's Gospel in relation to the other Synoptists strikes me, I proceed to group instances together, and to consider what general induction, if any, can be drawn from them. Many of the points have emerged in the course of the investigation into the 'agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark' on which I have been engaged in my Seminar for some years—an investigation now nearly complete. To the members of my Seminar (and I may be allowed to single out the Rev. R. H. Lightfoot of New College and the Rev. C. H. Dodd of Mansfield College) I owe very much, and I must not omit also to mention the expert help of Mr J. U. Powell of St John's College, on whose knowledge of the literature concerned with the history and developement of the Greek language I draw whenever I am at a loss myself, and never draw in vain.

One characteristic of the present notes I should specially wish to emphasize, though I claim no finality for the conclusions which I have suggested, and that is the possibility that the Greek of St Mark has owed something, through his residence at Rome, to the influence of Latin. We all know that he transliterates Latin words more frequently than the other evangelists: but I suspect that Latin influence goes much farther than that, and I doubt whether writers on New Testament Greek have given adequate consideration to this side of their subject. I should like some one to treat systematically the Greek of Mark and of Hermas—both of them non-literary authors, both of them writing Greek in Rome—from this point of view.

My last instalment (IX: *J. T. S.* April 1928, xxix 275–289) was prepared under some pressure, during recovery from illness, and needs supplementing at two points.

i. Too late for insertion into my note on ἀποστερεῖν, pp. 275, 276, I consulted the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* under *abnego*, and the reference there given to Wölfflin's article in his *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie* iv (1887) pp. 574–577. Wölfflin did not, I think, fully grasp the relation between *abnego* and ἀποστερεῖν in early Christian writers: but his collection of examples of *abnego*, as used of the refusal to return a sum deposited, is admirably full, and I complete my own list, *loc. cit.* p. 276, by the following:

Irenaeus *adv. Haer.* II xxxii 1 (xlviii 4) 'non solum non abnegare quae sunt aliena, sed etiam si sua auferantur illis [? aliis] non expostulare'.

Tertullian *ad Scapulam* 4 'Praeter haec depositum non abnegamus, matrimonium nullius adulteramus, pupillos pie tractamus, indigentibus refrigeramus, nulli malum pro malo reddimus'.

de fuga 12 *ad fin.* 'Quid autem Deo debeo, sicut denarium Caesari, nisi sanguinem quem pro me filius fudit ipsius? quodsi Deo quidem hominem et sanguinem meum debeo, nunc uero in eo sum tempore ut quod Deo debeo expostuler. utique fraudem Deo facio, id agens ne quod debeo soluam: bene obseruaui praeceptum, Caesari reddens quae sunt Caesaris, Deo uero quae sunt Dei abnegans'.

ii. In dealing with the compounds of πορεύεσθαι (p. 289) I omitted εἰσπορεύεσθαι (Mark 8, Matthew 1, Luke 5). Mark i 21 (no parallels): iv 19 (Matthew omits, Luke substitutes πορευόμενοι, but also changes the sense): v 40 (no parallels): vi 56 (Matthew omits; no parallel in Luke): vii 15, 18, 19, of the things that 'go into' a man (no parallel in Luke; Matt. 1° substitutes εἰσερχόμενον, 2° retains εἰσπορευόμενον, 3° omits): xi 2 (Matthew omits, Luke retains). Luke certainly does not dislike the form, for twice where Mark has εἰσέρχεσθαι (Mark x 23, xiv 14) he substitutes εἰσπορεύεσθαι. Matthew on the other hand, it seems, avoids very generally any compound of πορεύεσθαι (though he shews no reluctance to use πορεύεσθαι itself), preferring the compounds of ἔρχεσθαι, especially εἰσέρχεσθαι and προσέρχεσθαι.

(1) *Titles used in addressing Christ.*

i. Ῥαββεί (Ῥαββουνεί)

(*Mark four times*: *Matthew once* [*by Judas*]: *Luke never*).

1. ix 5 Ῥαββεί, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι. Matthew κύριε, Luke ἐπιστάτα.

2. x 51 Ῥαββουνεί, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω. Matthew and Luke κύριε.

3. xi 21 Ῥαββεί, ἴδε ἡ συκῆ ἣν κατηράσω ἐξήρανται. Matthew changes the form of the sentence: no parallel in Luke.

4. xiv 45 Ῥαββεί· καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. Luke omits the address of Judas: Matthew, here only, retains the vocative Ῥαββεί.

ii. Διδάσκαλε

(*Mark ten times*: *Matthew six*: *Luke twelve*).

5. iv 38 Διδάσκαλε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα; As in 1 above, Matthew has κύριε, Luke ἐπιστάτα.

6. ix 17 Διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου. Again Matthew substitutes κύριε: Luke retains διδάσκαλε, as in **8**, 11, 12, 13, in each case because it is not a disciple who is speaking.

7. ix 38 Διδάσκαλε, εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου . . . Luke ἐπιστάτα, for John is the speaker. No parallel in Matthew.

8. x 17 Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω . . . Both Luke (see on **6**) and Matthew (as also in 11, 12) retain διδάσκαλε, for the reason given on **6** above.

9. x 20 Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην . . . Omitted by the other two, no doubt because the formal address had been used only three verses before.

10. x 35 Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμεν . . . Omitted by Matthew: no parallel in Luke.

11. xii 14 (Pharisees and Herodians) ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Διδάσκαλε . . . So both the others: they had no objection to the word as used by other Jews than the disciples.

12. xii 19 (Sadducees) ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες Διδάσκαλε . . . So both the other two, for just the same reason as in the last case.

13. xii 32 εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεύς Καλῶς, διδάσκαλε . . . Retained by Luke again on the same principle as before: no parallel in Matthew.

14. xiii 1 Διδάσκαλε, ἴδε ποταποὶ λίθοι . . . The exclamation came from disciples, or a disciple, and so διδάσκαλε is avoided by Matthew: Luke, quite exceptionally, retains it in effect, for he inserts it two verses farther on.

iii. Κύριε

(*Mark once, by a non-Jew*: *Matthew twenty-two times, of which four occur in our Lord's teaching about Himself*: *Luke eighteen times*).

15. vii 28 Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης . . . And so, as we should expect, Matthew: there is no parallel in Luke. This unique occurrence of Κύριε in Mark is simply due to the fact that the woman was Ἑλληνίς, a heathen, and therefore used not the Jewish term 'Rabbi', but the ordinary title of respect 'Sir'.

Κύριε is inserted, where Mark has no title of address, at i 40 by both Matthew and Luke, at xiv 19 by Matthew, at xiv 29 by Luke.

iv. Ἰησοῦ

(Mark three times, but always with a further defining phrase, and twice in the mouth of evil spirits: Luke six times: Matthew never).

16. i 24 Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; So Luke: no parallel in Matthew.

17. v 7 Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; So again Luke: Matthew omits the personal name.

18. x 47 Υἱὲ Δαυεὶδ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν με. Again Luke follows Mark, though he inverts the personal and the official name: again Matthew retains the latter, but again omits Ἰησοῦ: according to many MSS he has Κύριε also. If an explanation is wanted of this isolated usage of the address 'Jesus' in Mark, it should perhaps be found in the setting of the episode as a whole. It is full of details that give it a place by itself in St Mark's Gospel: I believe it represents a story given *viva voce* by Bartimaeus to the evangelist, and therefore the phrase may well be that actually used by the man himself.

The deductions from the *data* here accumulated can be very briefly expressed. 'Rabbi', the Aramaic word, represented in Greek by διδάσκαλος, would have been in fact the form of address used to our Lord by any Jew, whether a disciple or not: and so Mark uses it, reserving κύριε for the solitary case where the speaker was not a Jew at all. But while Mark, or rather Peter, thus represents to us the language actually used in the days of our Lord's Ministry, the writers of the second generation could not picture our Lord's own disciples as addressing Him in the same way as those Jews did who were not His disciples: and therefore Matthew and Luke, while they retain the address Rabbi (Teacher) in the mouth of others than disciples—and Luke more consistently than Matthew—never allow it with disciples, save that Matthew keeps it in the case of Judas, no. 4, and Luke by exception in no. 14. Where Matthew and Luke differ, is just in this, that Matthew, when he substitutes another word, regularly employs κύριε (1, 2, 5, 6); Luke only once changes to κύριε (2), more often (1, 5, 7) to ἐπιστάτα. Ἐπιστάτα is only Lucan (six times in all): but even in Luke κύριε is much more common, and no doubt both Matthew and Luke mean by κύριε in this connexion not 'Sir' but 'Lord'.

(2) *Diminutives in Mark.*

i. θυγατριον

(twice in Mark: never in Matthew or Luke).

1. v 23 τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει. Both Matthew and Luke substitute θυγάτηρ.

2. vii 25 ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον. Matthew again θυγατήρ: no Lucan parallel.

ii. ἰχθύδιον

(*Mark once, Matthew once*).

3. viii 7 καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα. Retained in Matthew: there is no Luke.

iii. κοράσιον

(*Mark five times, Matthew thrice*: *never in Luke*).

4, 5. v 41, 42 Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον. Matthew omits the first, but retains the second, κοράσιον: but he also uses κοράσιον for the παιδίον of Mc. v 39. Luke changes the first κοράσιον to Ἡ παῖς, and omits the second.

6. vi 22 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τῷ κορασίῳ. The episode is absent from Luke, the word from Matthew.

7, 8. vi 28 ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κορασίῳ· καὶ τὸ κοράσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῇ μητρί. Matthew retains the word on the first occasion, omits it on the second.

iv. κυνάριον

(*Mark and Matthew twice each*: *not in Luke*).

8, 9. vii 27, 28 λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν. ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης . . . Not in Luke: Matthew has both the episode and the double mention of κυνάρια. Phrynichus (quoted by Wetstein: Rutherford *New Phrynichus* p. 268) says that κυνίδιον, not κυνάριον, is the correct form of the diminutive.

v. σανδάλιον

(*once in Mark, but nowhere else in the Gospels*).

10. vi 9 ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια. Not in either Matthew or Luke: Luke omits the item, perhaps because it breaks into the catalogue of things that the Apostles were *not* to take with them; Matthew more skilfully adapts it to the negative framework of the catalogue by substituting μηδὲ ὑποδήματα—if they were to wear 'little sandals', they were not to wear boots or shoes. The diminutive σανδάλιον is apparently commoner in Greek than the form σάνδαλον.

vi. ψιχίον

(*once each in Mark and Matthew*).

11. vii 28 καὶ τὰ κυνάρια . . . ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων. And similarly the parallel in Matthew. Both ψίξ and ψιχίον appear to be rare words, but Suidas recognizes both forms: cod. D has ψιχων in both Gospels.

vii. ὠτάριον

(*once in Mark, followed by John*: *not in Matthew or Luke*).

12. xiv 47 *ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον.* So ℵ B D 1; and in the parallel passage John xviii 10 ℵ B C* L W. The rest have *ὠτίον*, following Matthew. Luke has *οὖς* in xxii 50 without variant, in the next verse D (with the Old Latins) again gives *οὖς*, the other MSS *ὠτίον*. Of all examples of diminutives in Mark, this is the most instructive, for, in contrast to words like *θυγάτριον κοράσιον παιδίον*, ears of adults are more or less similar in size—we cannot suppose that Mark means that Malchus' ear was a particularly small one—and the diminutive must be due simply to the writer's fondness for that type of word. Moreover *ὠτάριον* is not only a diminutive, but a diminutive of a diminutive. *οὖς* is the classical form, and as such is used by Luke: *ὠτίον* is the first stage of change, occurs occasionally in the LXX, and was probably in common use in the *κοινή* (*οὖς ἀττικῶς, ὠτίον ἑλληνικῶς* is quoted from a grammarian by Wetstein on Matt. xxvi 51): *ὠτάριον* is a further stage of change, but is cited mainly from comic verse —it was doubtless only colloquial. It is typically Marcan, and John has followed Mark. The preservation of *ὠτάριον* in the Alexandrian text (with D in Mark, and W in John) is a striking testimony to their faithfulness, for it must have been just the word they would have liked to alter. Note that Matthew goes only one stage back in substituting *ὠτίον*, while Luke goes the whole way with *οὖς*.

One word, diminutive in form, is not included in the above list, namely *παιδίον*. All three Synoptists use it regularly,[1] but again there is a significant distinction to be drawn: *παῖς* is used, though less frequently than *παιδίον*, in both Matthew and Luke, but it is nowhere found in Mark, and therefore *παιδίον* takes its place. Thus in the story of Jaeirus' daughter Mark has (besides *θυγάτηρ, θυγάτριον*, and *κοράσιον*) four instances of *παιδίον*, Matthew has *θυγάτηρ* and *κοράσιον*, Luke has *θυγάτηρ* and (twice) *παῖς*. The child was twelve years old, so that Luke made the dividing line between *παῖς* and *παιδίον* at an earlier point than twelve. Again in the miracle of ix 17–27 the boy healed had suffered *ἐκ παιδιόθεν* (*v.* 21), and therefore cannot have been a mere child: moreover he is brought to Christ, not carried (*vv.* 19, 20)—not to say that he is called by his father at the opening of the story (*v.* 17) 'my son': yet we have in Mark (*v.* 24) *ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου.* We are not surprised that both Matthew and Luke call the boy not *παιδίον* but *παῖς*. Clearly then there is no justification for translating the word in Mark 'little child', as R. V. in ix 36, 37, x 13, 14, 15: in ix 36, 37 A. V. rightly has 'child' 'children', and in x 13 'young children' of A. V. is less incorrect than R. V.'s 'little children'.[1]

---

[1] Mark 12; Matthew 18, but chapter ii accounts for just half the instances; Luke 13, and again about half in chapters i and ii. Thus Mark is the one of the three who, apart from the Infancy narratives, uses the word most.

In the result Mark's fondness for diminutive forms is well established; at least with *ὠτάριον* and *παιδίον*, perhaps with other words, he uses such forms without any necessarily diminutive sense about them. Luke uses none of Mark's diminutives at all except *παιδίον*, and that, as we have just seen, as strictly diminutive in contrast with *παῖς*. Matthew, as so often, takes an intermediate place. Put in other words, Luke upholds a literary tradition stringently, Matthew makes some concession to popular usage, Mark reproduces whole-heartedly the colloquial talk of everyday life. The fondness for diminutives grows with the growth of the language. They are absent from Homer: they begin to abound in Aristophanes and the later comedians: in the first century after Christ it must have been a conscious literary archaism to avoid them.

(3) *The verb at the end of the sentence, after noun or personal pronoun.*

(a) *with the verb ἅπτεσθαι*

(*Mark eleven, Matthew ten, Luke ten*).

ἅπτεσθαι is thus a rather favourite word of Mark's, and his fondness for putting the verb after the pronoun (or noun) is specially noticeable in relation to it, so that I have treated it separately.

1. i 41 *ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο.* Both Matthew and Luke *ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ.* Perhaps the caution should be given that in Mark *αὐτοῦ* goes of course with *ἥψατο* and not with *τὴν χεῖρα*, which according to Greek idiom (and Latin usage is similar) would mean 'his hand' without the addition of any pronoun.

2. iii 10 *ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται ὅσοι εἶχον μάστιγας.* No parallel in Matthew: but Luke again changes the order *πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐζήτουν ἅπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ.*

[v 27 *ἥψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ.* So by exception (though the addition of *τοῦ ἱματίου* makes the exception less marked), and so naturally the other two Synoptists here retain the same order of words.]

3. v 28 *ἐὰν ἅψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ.* So the critical editions, and so Matthew (Luke drops the verse): but Marcan usage makes it more than probable that the Alexandrian reading—it is only found in ℵ B C L Δ Θ—is an assimilation to the previous verse or to Matthew,

---

[1] Luke, however, here (xviii 15) has *βρέφη*, interpreting Mark's *παιδία*—rightly or wrongly—in this sense. He also uses *βρέφος* four times in chapters i and ii, of the babe in the womb or newly born: his terms for age are more clearly articulated (as we should expect) than those of the other evangelists.

and that we ought to follow the rest of our authorities, including D and the Latins (it is true that Latins may be just following the idiom of their language), and invert the order κἂν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ ἅψωμαι.

4. v 30 Τίς μου ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων; Luke substitutes Τίς ὁ ἁψάμενός μου; Matthew drops the verse.

5. v 31 καὶ λέγεις Τίς μου ἥψατο; Matthew again gives no parallel: Luke, changing the interrogation to a statement, alters the order to Ἥψατό μού τις.

6. vi 56 ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται. No Luke: but Matthew makes the expected change ἵνα μόνον ἅψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ.

7. vi 56 *b* καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἥψαντο αὐτοῦ διεσώθησαν. But I suspect that with the Old Latins and Matthew (there is no Luke) we ought to omit αὐτοῦ. If Matthew had found αὐτοῦ in that position in his text of Mark, why in the world should he have omitted it?

[vii 33 πτύσας ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ. Compare v 27 above: no parallel in either Matthew or Luke.]

8. viii 22 παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψηται. Again no parallels.

9. x 13 προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψηται. So W-H with ℵ B C L Δ Θ 124 and Luke: Matthew ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς. But Tischendorf in Mark has ἅψηται αὐτῶν with the mass of authorities, including D W Old Latins and Origen. Decision is difficult: yet can we suppose that Luke found before him in Mark ἅψηται αὐτῶν, and altered it to αὐτῶν ἅψηται?

(b) *Other instances in Mark of the verb placed last, after its object, or the noun after the pronoun depending on it.*

10. i 44 σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ. So Matthew: but Luke δεῖξον σεαυτόν.

11. ii 5, 9 ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, with Matthew: Luke ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου.

12. iii 11 ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν. No parallels.

13. iv 30 ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν; No parallel in Matthew: Luke τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν;

14. iv 41 ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούει. So in effect Matt.: Luke again inverts verb and personal pronoun, ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

15. v 4 οὐδεὶς ἴσχυεν αὐτὸν δαμάσαι. No parallels.

16. v 10 ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ . . . No parallel in Matthew: Luke ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς . . .

17. vi 17 ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν. No parallel.

18. vi 20 ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν. Matthew in effect retains the construction while he alters the sense, ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον. No Luke.

19. vii 18 οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι. No parallel.

20. ix 18 *a* ὅπου ἐὰν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ. Matthew omits: Luke, though with a change to the direct construction, ἰδοὺ πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτόν.

21. ix 18 *b* ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσιν. Omitted by Matthew: Luke again transposes, ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν αὐτό.

22. ix 19 ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι; So in effect Matthew: Luke ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς;

23. ix 32 ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι. Matthew has another phrase: Luke transposes ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτόν.

24. ix 37 ὃς ἂν ἓν τῶν παιδίων τούτων δέξηται. Here both the other Synoptists transpose, ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται ἓν παιδίον τοιοῦτο (Luke τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον).

25. x 2 εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι. No Luke: but Matthew ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

26. x 32 ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λεγειν. Matthew and Luke both omit ἤρξατο, but both put the personal pronoun last, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς.

27. xi 28 τίς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν . . .; Both Matthew and Luke transfer τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην to the end, after the verb.

28. xii 12 *a* ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι. So Matthew: Luke ἐζήτησαν . . . ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας.

29. xii 12 *b* ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν. Matthew omits the noun, Luke transposes it εἶπεν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην.

30. xii 13 ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ. So Matthew: but Luke ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου.

31 (cf. 23). xii 34 οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι. Matthew ἐπερωτῆσαι αὐτὸν οὐκέτι, Luke ἐπερωτᾶν αὐτὸν οὐδέν.

32. xiv 1 πῶς αὐτὸν . . . ἀποκτείνωσιν. So in substance Matthew, but with τὸν Ἰησοῦν for αὐτόν: Luke τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν.

33. xiv 10 ἵνα αὐτὸν προδοῖ [παραδοῖ] αὐτοῖς. Both the others invert dative and accusative: Luke τὸ πῶς αὐτοῖς παραδῷ αὐτόν, Matthew ἐγὼ ὑμῖν παραδώσω αὐτόν.

34. xiv 11 πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαιρως παραδοῖ. So Matthew ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῷ: but Luke εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτόν.

35. xiv 12 ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον. No parallel in Matthew: but Luke ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα.

36. xiv 14 ὅπου τὸ πάσχα . . . φάγω. Luke by exception agrees: it is here Matthew who inverts, ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα.

37. xiv 30 τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. Both the other Synoptists invert: Matthew τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με, Luke τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι με.

38. xiv 42 ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικεν. No parallel in Luke: Matthew ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδούς με. Strictly speaking this instance does not come

under the heading of verb and object, as ἤγγικεν is intransitive ; but the change of order in Matthew seems significant.

39. xiv 47 ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον. So Matthew: but Luke ἀφεῖλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν. Possibly Mark meant αὐτοῦ to depend upon ἀφεῖλεν, and if so his phrase would stand: but certainly Luke interpreted him in the other sense.

40. xiv 63 τί ἔτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; with Matthew. Even here, where change seems less necessary, Luke alters to τί ἔτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρείαν;

41. xiv 65 οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔβαλον. No parallels.

42. xiv 72 ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν, and so Matthew: but Luke ἐφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ.

43. xv 31 ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι. So Matthew, and the emphasis on ἄλλους . . . ἑαυτόν seems to justify the order: but again Luke's instinct is for change, ἄλλους ἔσωσεν σωσάτω ἑαυτόν.

44. xvi 7 ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε. Here, though Matthew follows Mark the order seems indefensible in Greek: but unfortunately there is no Lucan parallel.

It is not suggested that these instances are typical of Mark in the sense that this order of words is his normal usage: but they are not inconsiderable in number, and Luke's alteration of them in almost every case, whether instinctive or intentional, is certainly no mere accident—not even though the actual converse happens on occasion, as for instance (if our texts are correct) Mark xi 17 πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον ληστῶν, where the others give αὐτὸν ἐποιεῖτε (ἐποιήσατε) σπήλαιον ληστῶν. In thirteen of our forty-four cases there is no Lucan parallel: of the remaining thirty-one, Luke makes the change to the normal Greek order of words in no less than twenty-nine, the exceptions being only 9, 36. Matthew, as so often, stands in between Mark and Luke, altering the Marcan order about as frequently as he leaves it unchanged; that is to say, out of twenty-eight cases where his text is parallel, he follows Mark in fourteen and diverges in thirteen (7 being a doubtful reading in Mark).

Whence did Mark derive his occasional use of an order of words so fundamentally alien to the Greek language? Greek puts the emphatic words in the forefront of the sentence, and the verb therefore cannot be left to the last. Latin, on the other hand, habitually closes the sentence with the verb. The conclusion seems irresistible that—just as Jerome in the Vulgate introduces a Graecizing order, putting words like *eius*, for instance, at the end of the sentence—Mark introduces in the Greek of his Gospel a Latinizing order. The influence which Mark's years of residence in Rome exercised over the developement of his literary Greek style (if one may use such a phrase about his Gospel at all) was doubtless not inconsiderable. The Greek he had picked up in his boyhood at Jerusalem was, we may assume, wholly non-literary and colloquial. That it came in a Latin-speaking city to such maturity as it attained, is suggested forcibly by the feature of it which we have now been examining.

(4) ἵνα (*Mark* 1½ *columns, Matthew barely* 1, *Luke* 1; *John nearly* 3). *But in the following list* ἵνα *is only included when not used with its proper sense of purpose.*

1. iii 9 καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα πλοιάριον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ. No parallels.

2. v 18 παρεκάλει ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾖ. Luke ἐδέετο . . . εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ. No parallel in Matthew.

3. v 23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ . . . ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ—so I think Mark means to construct the ἵνα (cf. 10). Matthew turns the sentence into *oratio recta*, ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες . . . Luke omits.

4. v 43 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο. Nothing parallel in Matthew: Luke again has infinitive παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.

5. vi 8 καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδόν. Both the others substitute the *oratio recta*, μὴ κτήσησθε, μηδὲν αἴρετε.

6. vi 12 καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοῶσιν. Luke omits the phrase: Matthew has no parallel.

7. vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῷς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι . . . Matthew omits θέλω ἵνα and writes δός μοι ὧδε ἐπὶ πίνακι. Luke has no parallel for the six cases 7–12.

8. vi 56 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται. Here for the first time Matthew follows Mark.

9. vii 26 ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ . . . Matthew again substitutes the *oratio recta*.

10. vii 32 καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα. Matthew omits the whole clause.

11. vii 36 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν. No parallel.

12. viii 22 καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψηται. No parallel.

13. viii 30 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ. Matthew for the second time agrees, διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν . . . Luke, as in 2 and 4, substitutes the infinitive, παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο.

14. ix 9 διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ ἃ εἶδον διηγήσωνται. Matthew changes to a command in the *oratio recta*, μηδενὶ εἴπητε τὸ ὅραμα, Luke to a statement of fact, οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν . . . οὐδὲν ὧν ἑώρακαν.

15. ix 12 *πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ.* No parallel.

16. ix 18 *καὶ εἶπα τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσιν.* Matthew omits the *ἵνα* clause, Luke (with *ἐδεήθη* for *εἶπα*) here retains it.

17. ix 30 *καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ.* Both the others omit the phrase.

18. x 35 *θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν.* Matthew omits the clause, Luke the whole episode, including **19**.

19. x 37 *δὸς ἡμῖν ἵνα εἷς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν . . . καθίσωμεν.* And so Matthew, *εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν . . .*

20. x 48 *καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ πολλοὶ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ.* So both Matthew and Luke, as in the next case.

21. x 51 *ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ῥαββουνί, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω.* I believe that the construction with *ἵνα* depends (cf. no. **3**) on the verb of the preceding verse *θέλω ποιήσῃς.* Both Matthew and Luke follow Mark closely here, and presumably constructed *ἵνα* in the same way after *θέλειν.*

22. xi 16 *καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ.* No parallels.

23. xi 28 *ἢ τίς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς;* The *ἵνα* clause is strictly superfluous after *ταύτην*, and both Matthew and Luke seize on so good an excuse for omitting it.

24. xii 19 *Μωυσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν . . . ἵνα λάβῃ . . .* It would appear that *ἵνα*, which is not part of the O. T. quotation, must depend on *ἔγραψεν.* Matthew re-writes the quotation: Luke follows Mark, possibly supposing that *ἵνα λάβῃ* was from the LXX.

25. xiii 34 *καὶ τῷ θυρωρῷ ἐνετείλατο ἵνα γρηγορῇ.* No parallels.

26. xiv 12 *ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα;* Luke omits the *ἵνα* clause, Matthew substitutes the infinitive *φαγεῖν.*

27. xiv 35 *προσηύχετο ἵνα εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν παρέλθῃ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα.* Where Mark as here, and occasionally elsewhere, makes a statement in *oratio obliqua* and follows it by the same thing in *oratio recta*, Matthew and Luke do not repeat both of the two but prefer that in *oratio recta*; Matthew, however, has clearly taken *εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν παρελθάτω* from Mark's *ἵνα παρέλθῃ*, so that in his case at least the *ἵνα* clause is turned into a direct prayer.

28. xv 11 *οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς.* So in substance Matthew, with *ἔπεισαν* for *ἀνέπεισαν*: Luke has the *oratio recta*, *ἀνέκραγον δὲ πανπληθεὶ λέγοντες Αἶρε τοῦτον ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν Βαραββᾶν.*

29. xv 15 *καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰ. φραγελλώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.* So Matthew: Luke *παρέδωκεν τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.*

0. xv 20 *καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν.* Both **30** and **29**

could be rendered 'in order that', but in both cases the meaning is just 'to be crucified' 'to crucify', and Matthew rightly interprets with εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι. There is no parallel in Luke.

31. xv 21 καὶ ἀγγαρεύουσιν . . . Σίμωνα . . . ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ. As in **29** Matthew follows Mark: Luke substitutes an infinitive, φέρειν.

Some of these instances of ἵνα, and perhaps especially the last three, are not so clearly non-purposive as the rest, and it is hardly surprising that Matthew here and there (**8**, **13**, **19**, **20**, **21**, **28**, **29**, **31**) accepts the construction, as even Luke, though more rarely, does sometimes (**16**, **20**, **21**, **24**). But the general instinct of both is to make a change, Matthew twelve times out of twenty, Luke thirteen times out of seventeen. Sometimes they merely omit: in other cases they substitute the *oratio recta* (so especially Matthew, five times: Luke twice) or an infinitive (so especially Luke, four times: Matthew once or twice).

But what then is the explanation of Mark's fondness for ἵνα after verbs like παρακαλεῖν διαστέλλεσθαι παραγγέλλειν ἐπιτιμᾶν ἐντέλλεσθαι and others? I cannot help thinking that we have here another illustration of the influence of the Latin of Rome on Mark's Greek: for in Latin we have *rogo ut*, *oro ut*, *impero ut*, *moneo* (*admoneo*) *ut*, *suadeo ut*, and so on.

No doubt ἵνα in the Κοινή generally was coming into much more general use than it had enjoyed in Attic Greek: any grammar of New Testament Greek will illustrate the point that ἵνα is no longer confined to the sense of purpose, and references need not be accumulated here. But writers on New Testament Greek are (naturally) inclined to exaggerate the extent to which it is a single self-contained whole: if these 'notes on Marcan usage' have done nothing else, they have, I hope, established the result that the Greek of one of the three Synoptic writers does shew broad, almost fundamental, differences from the Greek of the other two. And the more we emphasize the enlarged use of ἵνα throughout the range of the Κοινή, the more pressing, as it seems to me, is the need for accounting for the contrast in this respect between Mark and Luke. If Mark's extended use of ἵνα is not to be explained as a vulgarism, some other way of explaining it must be sought.

Now there are two or three directions in which recent investigations cited in Moulton's *Prolegomena* to the Grammar of N. T. Greek (1906) offer instructive parallels. Thumb (Moulton, p. 205) concludes that there were two rival tendencies, with a geographical dividing line between them, in this matter, Asiatic Greek leaning to a larger use of the infinitive, Western and European Greek to the universalizing of *ἵνα* (it will be noted that Luke, as pointed out above, sometimes replaces the *ἵνα* of Mark by an infinitive), the European use having in modern Greek ousted the other alternative. To a similar result are we led by Kälker's emphasis (Moulton, p. 206) on the frequency of *ἵνα* in Polybius —for Polybius spent a large proportion of the years of his adult life in Italy. Add to this that Mark has been shewn, half a dozen pages back, to adopt, often enough to call for explanation, an order of words in his Greek which is not a Greek order but a Latin: and I submit that the thesis needs consideration that his exaggerated use of *ἵνα* should be traced back to the same source, his years of residence in Rome.[1]

These scholars who, like Moulton himself (p. 20)[1] and Rademacher (*Neutestamentliche Grammatik* p. 11), restrain within very narrow limits the influence of Latin on Hellenistic and New Testament Greek have perhaps not sufficiently investigated the possibility of this influence being specially great in individual writers such as St Mark: and it is only with regard to St Mark in contrast to the other two Synoptists that I plead for a reconsideration of the case.

(5) *Absence of* λέγων (λέγοντες) *after verbs introducing a statement or a question, where Matthew and Luke add or substitute it.*

i. ἀγανακτεῖν

1. xiv 4 *ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς Εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὕτη . . .;* Matthew *ἠγανάκτησαν λέγοντες Εἰς τί . . .* No Luke.

ii. ἀποκρίνεσθαι

2. viii 4 *ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι Πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεταί τις . . .* Matthew *λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί Πόθεν ἡμῖν . . .* No Luke.

3. ix 17 *ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἷς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου Διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου.* Matthew *προσῆλθεν . . . λέγων,* Luke *ἐβόησεν λέγων.*

4. xii 29 *ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρώτη ἐστίν . . .* Matthew *ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ . . .* Luke *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν . . .*

iii. βοᾶν

5. xv 34 *ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Ἡλεὶ Ἡλεὶ . . .* Matthew *ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰ. φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων . . .* No parallel in Luke: but cf. no. 3.

---

[1] Moulton (p. 21 and p. 21 n. 3) admits that some writers are more disposed than he is himself to allow some place to Latin influence, e.g. Blass *Grammatik des NTlichen Griechisch* p. 4; and on more general lines W. Schulze *Graeca Latina.*

iv. διαλογίζεσθαι

6. ii 6 διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν Τί οὗτος οὕτω λαλεῖ; Luke ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι λέγοντες Τίς . . . Matthew εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Οὗτος . . .

7. viii 16 διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν. Matthew διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες ὅτι Ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν. No Luke.

v. διαστέλλεσθαι

8. ix 9 διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδένι ἃ εἶδον διηγήσωνται. Matthew ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰ. λέγων· Μηδενὶ εἴπητε τὸ ὅραμα. No Luke.

vi. ἐπερωτάω (ἐρωτάω)

9. v 9 ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν Τί ὄνομά σοι; Luke ἐπερώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰ. λέγων Τί σοι ὄνομά ἐστιν; Nothing parallel in Matthew.

10. vii 26 ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς. Matthew προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγουσα Κύριε, βοήθει μοι. No Luke.

11. viii 5 ἠρώτα αὐτούς Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; Matthew substitutes λέγει for ἠρώτα. There is no Luke.

12. viii 29 ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Matthew and Luke substitute λέγει (εἶπεν) for ἐπηρώτα.

13. ix 28 κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν Ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; Once more Matthew κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπον· Διὰ τί ἡμεῖς . . . No parallel to this verse in Luke.

14. x 2 ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν Εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι; πειράζοντες αὐτόν. Matthew προσῆλθον αὐτῷ . . . πειράζοντες αὐτὸν καὶ λέγοντες Εἰ ἔξεστιν . . . Again no Luke.

15. x 17 προσδραμὼν εἷς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν Διδάσκαλε . . . Luke adds λέγων (ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων λέγων Διδάσκαλε . . .), Matthew as elsewhere substitutes εἶπεν (εἷς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν Διδάσκαλε . . .).

16. xii 28 ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν Ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη . . . Matthew for once repeats Mark's phrase; Luke, in a more or less parallel passage, substitutes ἀνέστη . . . λέγων.

17. xiii 3 ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος . . . Εἰπὸν ἡμῖν πότε . . . Both Matthew and Luke add λέγοντες: Luke keeps ἐπηρώτησαν, for which Matthew has his favourite phrase προσῆλθον αὐτῷ.

18. xv 2 ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πειλᾶτος Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰ.; Both the others retain the verb (Luke ἠρώτησεν), but both add λέγων.

[vii. ἐπιτιμάω

19. i 25 ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε. So Tischendorf with ℵ*A*, but the rest agree with Luke ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰ. λέγων . . ., and that may probably be right: though the caution must

be given that the Old Latins frequently add *dicens* where Mark's text is without it (so *k* in ix 29, x 17, xii 28, xv 2: not in x 2, xiii 3), presumably following the idiom of their language.]

viii. *κατακρίνειν*

20. xiv 64 *οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου.* Matthew turns it with *λέγειν* into the *oratio recta* *οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον· Ἔνοχος θανάτου ἐστίν.* No parallel in Luke.

[ix. *κηρύσσειν*

21. i 14, 15 *κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον [τῆς βασιλείας] τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι Πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός . . .* So again Tischendorf with ℵ* *c* Origen, against the rest, who add *λέγων* or *καὶ λέγων* before *ὅτι*; Matthew *ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν καὶ λέγειν.* Once more, as with *ἐπιτιμᾶν*, the want of clear Marcan parallels weights the balance against the reading of ℵ.]

x. *κράζω* (with *λέγειν*, however, 5/8)

22. xi 9 *ἔκραζον Ὡσαννά.* Matthew and Luke both add *λέγοντες*, and Luke substitutes *αἰνεῖν τὸν θεόν* for *κράζειν*.

23, 24. xv 13, 14 *ἔκραξαν· Σταύρωσον αὐτόν . . . περισσῶς ἔκραξαν Σταύρωσον αὐτόν.* Here Matthew has *λέγουσιν πάντες . . . περισσῶς ἔκραζον λέγοντες*; Luke has *ἐπεφώνουν λέγοντες* on the first occasion, and phrases the second differently.

xi. *λαλεῖν*

25. xiv 31 *ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει Ἐάν δέῃ με συναποθανεῖν σοι . . .* Matthew *λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος Κἂν δέῃ με . . .*, and so Luke, though he has only a rougher parallel, *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ.*

Perhaps no very striking results emerge. Nearly half the instances cited are in connexion with a single verb *ἐπερωτάω* (*ἐρωτάω*), and here we may safely say that Mark uses it without *λέγω*, the other two tend either to add *λέγω* (so Luke 4/6) or to substitute it (so Matt. 7/9). As to the remaining ten verbs, it is not meant to be suggested that Mark's normal usage is to employ them without *λέγω*: but even if the instances are exceptional, they are at the same time numerous enough to justify the impression that he can on occasion use any verb which implies 'saying' without adding the actual phrase 'saying', while with Matthew and Luke the rule is almost absolute the other way. And just as with Mark's *ἐπερωτάω*, so with the other verbs, Matthew prefers the substitution of *λέγω*, Luke the addition. Mark's omission of *λέγω* is no Latinism, but is probably just colloquial rather than literary language. But it accounts for some half-dozen of these agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark which have disturbed the judgement of so many critics.

C. H. TURNER.

NOUVEAUX SERMONS DE SAINT PIERRE CHRYSOLOGUE.

La transmission des sermons de Pierre Chrysologue est assez extraordinaire. Les originaux auraient péri dans l'incendie de Ravenne en 524. Un autre incendie du palais épiscopal en 700 aurait de nouveau détruit le recueil des sermons. Mais bientôt après, vers 715, l'évêque Félix réunit les 176 sermons qu'il put retrouver et les publia en y ajoutant une préface. Cette collection se trouve dans un bon nombre de manuscrits et a été souvent imprimée. Les éditions les plus notables sont l'édition princeps de Bologne en 1534, celle de Dominicus Mita à Bologne en 1643, celle de Martin del Castillo à Lyon en 1676, enfin celle de Sébastien Pauli à Venise en 1750, reproduite dans Migne *P. L.* lii. Toutes reproduisent la préface de Félix et les 176 sermons, toujours dans le même ordre; c'est ce qu'on appelle la collection Félicienne. Sébastien Pauli se hasarda à ajouter à cette collection un supplément, avec numérotation spéciale, de 7 sermons 'qui huc usque alieno nomine circumferebantur'. Par une incroyable distraction il ne s'est pas aperçu que 5 sermons de ce supplément figurent déjà dans le recueil de Félix (nos. 67, 68, 70, 71, 72). Liverani publia encore 9 sermons qu'il attribua au Chrysologue, mais cette opinion n'a trouvé que peu d'écho.

Les critiques se sont beaucoup occupés du saint évêque de Ravenne et on peut résumer ainsi leur jugement sur l'authenticité des sermons: (1) parmi les 176 sermons il y en a quatre ou cinq qui sont faux, (2) en dehors des 176 il n'y a aucun sermon sûrement authentique, (3) toute la tradition manuscrite remonte à l'évêque Félix.

Il n'est pas difficile de démontrer que lex deux dernières affirmations patronnées par Looshorn, G. Böhmer et G. Krüger,[1] sont fausses. Le manuscrit Vatic. 5758 de Bobbio, en belle écriture onciale, ne peut pas être postérieur à la première moitié du vii^{e} siècle, car il vient *de arca boboleni* comme il est dit f 1: il était donc dans le coffre où Bobolenus (vers 640) enfermait ses livres, il n'est pas dit que Bobolenus l'ait écrit ou fait écrire. Il contient deux séries de sermons nettement distinctes, ayant chacune sa table spéciale. Voici les titres et les incipit de la première série avec l'indication des éditions où on pourra lire le texte. Le premier numéro étant dépourvu de titre, je prends celui de la table. La numérotation est de seconde main dans le corps du volume et dans la table, celle-ci réunit aussi en un seul les sermons ii–iiii et finit par ces mots *fieri simul tractatus xx* (il faut lire xxi). Mai dans sa *Novae Patrum bibliothecae Tomus Primus* (1852) a édité 9 sermons inédits de cette série et un sermon déjà connu. On trouve 9 sermons qui figurent dans le recueil Félicien, un sermon authentique de saint Augustin et deux rejetés par les Mauristes dans l'*Appendix*. Une partie du sermon iii est restée inédite jusqu'aujourd'hui et est publiée ci-dessous. Les 18 premiers sermons sont, comme nous verrons, du même auteur, de saint Pierre Chrysologue ; les trois qui suivent sont une addition de nature et d'origine différente : ils sont seuls à avoir chacun une indication d'auteur[1] ; ils sont seuls à expliquer le psautier ; ils diffèrent absolument des précédents pour le style et le vocabulaire.

---

[1] Looshorn *Zeitschr. f. Kath. Theol.* 3 (1879) 238; G. Böhmer *Petrus Chrysologus als Prediger* (Predigt-Studien 1), Paderborn 1920; Schanz-Krüger *Gesch. d. röm. Litteratur* iv 2 (Handb. d. Altertumswiss.) 1924. Je n'ai pas vu Peters *Petrus Chrysol. als Homilet*, Cologne 1919.

I. De adam et eua et sancta maria. *Cum deus opifex* Mai 1.
II. De natale domini. *Debetur quidem uobis ff. kk. natalicius sermo* Chrysol. 143.
III. Alius sermo de natale domini. *Ut hodie a me possit ff. k. maiestas* Aug. app. 124 + partie inédite.
IIII. De eo quod fugit in aegyptum. *Hodierna lectio ff. mouit corda* Chrysol. 151.
V. Tractatus de occisione infantium ab herode. *Zelus quo tendat* Chrysol. 152 = Mai 109.
VI. Sermo de epifania. *Intellegere possumus ff. k. quantam* Aug. app. 135 n. 1–4.
VII. Sermo de natale sancti iohannis baptistae. *Aurum de terra legere* Aug. app. 199. Chrysol. 91—cantilena. Migne 458 b.
VIII. Sermo contra fariseos. *Contra fariseos loqui nos hodie* Mai 2 = Liverani 7.
VIIII. De arbore fici. *Sicut peritus magister* Chrysol. 106.
X. Sermo de ieiunio. *Quoniam ieiunii uernum et tempus bellorum* Chrysol. 12.
XI. Sermo de diuite et lazaro. *Non tam facile* Mai 3.
XII. Sermo de muliere cananea. *Domini et saluatoris nostri* Mai 4.
XIII. Sermo de iracundia fratrum. *Audistis hodie qualiter* Mai 5.
XIIII. Sermo de inimicis diligendis. *Conpello caelum uoco terram* Mai 6.

---

[1] En haut de la table, ou plutôt des deux tables qui se suivent, il est dit *Sermones s. Augustini*, mais dans le corps du manuscrit les 18 premiers sermons sont tous anonymes.

XV. SERMO UBI ROGATUS EST IESUS AD PRANDIUM. *Omnia quae a christo* Chrysol. 95.

XVI. SERMO DE MULIERE ADULTERA. *Agnouistis ff. si tamen* Mai 8.

XVII. SERMO DE RESURRECTIONE DOMINI. *Quantum a uobis ego* Chrysol. 75.

XVIII. SERMO DE NATALE DOMINI. *Quantum secretum cubiculi* Chrysol. 141.

XVIIII. SANCTI AUGUSTINI SERMO DE PSALMO XXXVI. *Ante paululum cantauimus* Mai 9.

XX. EIUSDEM DE PSALMO XI. *Bene scitis ff. quoniam* Mai 10

XXI. EIUSDEM DE PSALMO XLVIIII. *Quantum nobis ualeat* Aug. Enarr. in ps. 49.

Voici la finale inédite du sermon III.

Exsurgens ergo ioseph accepit puerum et matrem eius.[a] nisi euigilauerit fides, accipere[1] dominum non potest. audi iterum apostulum dicentem: *exurge qui dormis et inluminabit*[2] *te christus.*[b] in ioseph, fratres, qui per aegyptum circumfert dominum, typum apostolicae praedicationis fuisse non dubito,[3] sicut in sancta maria sancte ecclesiae figuram fuisse manifestum est, quae disponsata quidem fuerat ioseph, sed sponsa inuenta est spiritui sancto. denique spiritus generat, fides concipit,[4] uirginitas parit, integritas perseuerat, nullam pudor potest sentire iacturam ubi uirtus est conscia, non uoluptas, dicente apostulo: *disponsaui uos uni uiro uirginem castam exhibere christo.*[c]

Erat ergo ioseph in aegypto *usque ad obitum herodis,*[d] permanet ergo et apostolica praedicatio in hoc mundo ne princeps mundi fidelibus sit sepultus et possint dicere: *nobis mundus mortuus est et nos mundo,*[e] et iterum: *non iam nos uiuimus, sed uiuit in nos christus.*[f]

Unde nos qui uocati sumus ex gentibus et ex uariis nationibus congregati, honorificemus deum non uerbis tantum, sed operibus bonis, mundantes corda nostra a sordibus et malis cogitationibus et corpora nostra ab horridis et cenosis criminibus, ut fiant membra nostra habitaculum spiritus sancti et anima nostra semper sustinere[5] possit dominum et *uidere* mereamur *dies bonos*[g] et cum omnibus sanctis aeternum regnum et uitam perpetuam consequamur [in natiuitatem domini nostri iesu christi qui regnat in saecula saeculorum amen].[6]

---

[a] Matt. ii 14. [b] Eph. v 14. [c] 2 Cor. xi 2. [d] Matt. ii 15. [e] Cf. Gal. vi 14. [f] Gal. ii 20. [g] Ps. xxxiii 13.

[1] accepere *1m.* [2] inluminauit *1m.* [3] diuito *1m.* [4] concepit *1m.* [5] sustenire *1m.* [6] in natiuitatem . . . amen *add. scriptura cursiva.*

Les 9 sermons du Vaticanus qui figurent dans les éditions sont bien de l'évêque de Ravenne; tous les critiques sont d'accord là-dessus. Pour montrer que les autres sont du même auteur, nous ne dresserons pas de listes d'expressions communes que l'on pourrait suspecter, nous n'utiliserons pas des critères choisis pour les besoins de la cause. Deux critiques récents ont étudié les particularités de style et de vocabulaire qui caractérisent les sermons du Chrysologue, G. Böhmer au cours de son livre et surtout au dernier chapitre; puis, d'une façon plus méthodique et plus philologique, J. H. Baxter dans un article important du *J. T. S.*, 22, pp. 250–258. Lanzoni dans une série d'articles parus dans la *Rivista di scienze storiche* 1909–1910 a relevé aussi des particularités de ce genre, mais dans le but de prouver que certains sermons, considérés comme douteux, étaient authentiques. Les remarques de Lanzoni, que je ne discute pas, n'ont donc pas la stricte objectivité qui distingue celles de Baxter. C'est à ces dernières que nous nous bornons. Mais puisque le professeur de St Andrews semble inviter ses lecteurs à le critiquer, j'ajouterai trois observations. 1. Quand il dit que certaines particularités ne se trouvent que dans les sermons les plus anciens, je voudrais savoir à quoi il reconnaît leur âge. En suggérant ensuite que les sermons les plus anciens sont ceux où ces particularités dominent, je crains qu'il n'ait fait un *circulus vitiosus*. Que dans la collection Félicienne les sermons se suivent selon l'ordre chronologique, cela n'est ni démontré, ni probable. Lanzoni, qui connaît bien l'histoire de Ravenne, a essayé de dater quelques sermons d'après les allusions historiques qu'ils contiennent. Cette méthode semble la seule bonne. 2. Je doute que les listes de Baxter soient suffisamment complètes. On trouvera dans le recueil de Félix des sermons dont l'authenticitié n'a jamais été contestée et qui ne contiennent aucune des particularités de la liste. On trouvera sans doute aussi quelques particularités du Chrysologue dans des sermons qui ne sont pas de lui. 3. Par conséquent, la critique interne seule ne suffit pas toujours. Pour les sermons qui ne contiennent rien de propre au Chrysologue, rien aussi qui soit contraire à son style, il faudra tenir compte du contexte: s'ils figurent dans un recueil ancien du Chrysologue, on devra les considérer comme authentiques. C'est ainsi que Lanzoni et Böhmer, après avoir approuvé le jugement de Liverani au sujet de son 7^{e} sermon: *prae cunctis Chrysologum sapit iste sermo*, hésitent cependant à le proclamer authentique, parce qu'ils ignorent dans quelle collection il se trouve. Ce sermon se trouvant dans le Vaticanus 5758; je ne crois pas que quelqu'un puisse encore hésiter.

Baxter a créé un instrument de travail, qui n'est pas parfait, mais qui est très bon. Appliquons-le.

1. gén. ou adj. + verbe + *et* + verbe synonyme + subst.
   hodiernae lectionis pandit et reuelat auctoritas, 8, 1.
   totis currebat et serpebat in membris 8, 1.
2. adj. + verbe + prép. + subst.
   caelestem mutatur in panem quem uescendo aeternam perven mus ad uitam (sic cum Vatic.) 3, 3.
3. subst. + verbe + *et* (ou *nec*) + subst.
   nec uomere fuerat sauciata nec imbre 1, 3.
   sudorem attulit et laborem 1, 4.
   deo tantum uacaret et sibi 8, 2.
   terris miscetur et carni 14, 3.
   mortem pelleret et foetorem 14, 3.
4. hinc est quod 8, 2 ; 14, 3.
5. citation + hoc est dicere, 13, 2.
6. id est 16, 1 (2 ex.).
7. apostrophe fréquente ; les plus remarquables sont celles qui s'adressent à des absents : popule iudaee 12, 1, multitudo uesana 12, 1, iudaei, 16, 2 ; plus remarquable encore l'apostrophe homo 3, 3 ; 11, 2.
8. quid plura fratres 8, 2.
9. cit. + quare + cit. répétée.
   hydropicus ante illum. Quare *ante illum* 8, 1.
10. sed dicit aliquis 13, 3.
11. particule interrogative rejetée à la fin.
    Respondit cui ? 8, 2.
12. *est* avec génitif = c'est le propre de.
    humani iudicii est tractare 13, 1.
    non sit humani operis, muneris sit diuini 16, 1.
    quod erat non iudicii, sed furoris 16, 2.
    esse maioris (sic legendum) gloriae ignoscere quam punire 16, 3.
13. répétition au commencement d'une phrase.
    Tulit, plane tulit 13, 1 (je déplace la ponctuation).
    Tanta, fratres, tanta 13, 3.
14. composés avec *per*.
    peruigil 6, 5 ; perinanis 8 1 ; perdoceret 14, 3.
    La finale publiée ci-dessus a aussi le style du Chrysologue, il suffit de comparer.

Sermon III	finale
uirginitas concipit, integritas parit, dei est virtus conscia, non uoluptas.	spiritus generat, fides concipit, uirginitas parit, integritas perseuerat . . . ubi uirtus est conscia, non uoluptas.

L application des critères de Baxter donne les résultats suivants : dans le sermon 8 les particularités du Chrysologue se retrouvent abondamment ; dans sept autres sermons elles se retrouvent suffisamment pour fonder un jugement favorable ; dans le sermon 6 elles apparaissent fort peu, mais celui-là doit bénéficier de la présomption créée par le contexte : puisque sur 18 sermons 17 sont du Chrysologue, le sermon 6 doit lui être attribué, si on ne trouve rien qui s'oppose à l'authenticité.

Ajoutons quelques remarques, moins pour confirmer l'authenticité de nos sermons que pour relever quelques particularités remarquables.

Les Mauristes notent dans le sermon 135 de l'*Appendix* une expression théologiquement incorrecte : *Vix natus est hominibus et iam renascitur sacramentis.* Augustin a écrit fort justement : *ille singulariter natus est, cui renasci non opus fuit* (ep. 187, 31). La même incorrection se retrouve ailleurs dans le Chrysologue. Au début de ce même sermon 135 il faut lire avec le Vaticanus : *et iam nunc eum laetamur esse renatum,* où les manuscrits des Bénédictins ont corrigé (sans doute par scrupule d'orthodoxie) *et iam eum laetamur pro salute humani generis baptizatum.* Dans le sermon 157 du recueil Félicien nous lisons *ut quos nascendo in terra susceperat, hos renascendo leuaret in caelum* (M. 616 B).[1]

Dans le sermon 124, 2 de l'*Appendix* nous lisons *angelus mediator aduenit* ; il faut lire avec le Vaticanus *metator.* La même expression est appliquée par le Chrysologue à l'ange de l'Annonciation (M. 577 A) et à Jean Baptiste le précurseur (M. 457 A et 549 C).

Notons encore que le Vaticanus est d'accord avec le sermon 199 de l'*Appendix* plutôt qu'avec le sermon 91 du recueil Félicien ; il suit la recension courte, non la recension longue. On serait tenté de croire que ces deux témoins indépendants doivent l'emporter sur le témoignage du recueil. Il n'en est rien. Une lecture attentive des parties propres au sermon 91 ne permet pas de douter de leur authenticité. La recension courte est très ancienne, mais ce n'est pas le texte primitif.

Celui qui voudra connaître dans ses multiples aspects la vie de Ravenne au v^e siècle devra lire les sermons du Chrysologue ou le tableau qu'en a fait Lanzoni à l'aide de ces sermons. Je ne relève qu'un détail, parce qu'il a été jusqu'ici mal compris. Dans son sermon 173 l'évêque dit qu'il prêche tantôt *de gradu isto,* tantôt *de sacerdotali sede.* Lanzoni voit dans la *sedes* la cathédrale, c'est-à-dire la basilique Ursiana, dans le *gradus* une église plus petite. Avec Böhmer il faut admettre que la *sedes* était la chaire épiscopale placée au fond de l'abside. Quant au *gradus* que Böhmer entend des degrés de l'autel, je ne doute pas qu'on doive l'identifier avec l'ambon; c'est même, si je ne me trompe, l'exemple le plus ancien de *gradus* dans ce sens. Ce déplacement provoqua des murmures à Ravenne: *nec uos locorum mutatio tam propinqua et spatia sic artata aut reddant desides, aut faciant murmurantes.* Böhmer croit que l'on murmure quand l'évêque prêche de son siège, parce qu'on est plus à l'étroit dans l'abside. Mais le peuple n'entrait évidemment pas dans l'abside pour écouter, il conservait sa place, il n'y était pas à l'etroit. Quand l'évêque prêchait à l'ambon, l'espace entre l'évêque et le peuple était plus étroit, les regards et les remontrances du prédicateur atteignaient plus directement les coupables. Je comprends que ceux-ci n'approuvaient pas cette insistance, cette proximité menaçante, qui était probablement une innovation. Il y a là un trait de mœurs qu'il ne faut pas proposer à l'imitation, mais qu'il est intéressant de noter.

---

[1] Il faut ajouter, pour être juste, que l'incorrection n'est que dans les mots. Dans le même sermon VI l'évêque dit : *Christum non tam lauit unda, quam lota est.* Quand il dit que le Christ est *renatus,* il est victime de son amour de l'antithèse.

Les citations bibliques du Chrysologue mériteraient une étude, mais dans l'état actuel des textes, elle serait prématurée. Dans le sermon 143 nous lisons '*super humilem et mansuetum et trementem uerba mea* (Is. lxvi, 2). Humilem et mansuetum, quantum mansuetus est . . ., inmansuetus tantum est . . .' Qui douterait de la variante 'mansuetum' si bien attestée? Cependant le Vaticanus a '*humilem et quietum* . . . Humilem et quietum, quantum quietus est . . . inquietus est . . .' D'un côté ou de l'autre il y a eu une revision systématique.

DONATIEN DE BRUYNE, O.S.B.

THE TRIAL OF ST PAUL AT EPHESUS

THE theory that Paul was for a considerable period in prison during his three years stay in Ephesus while upon his third missionary journey (Acts xix), and the attempt to date from Ephesus the extant Captivity-letters, have met with a growing interest and appreciation. This is shewn by the literature upon the subject, the most complete bibliography of which is given by A. Deissmann in his work, *Paul: a study in social and religious history* (translated by W. E. Wilson, 2nd ed., London 1926, pp. 16–17). That numerous English scholars have applied themselves to the study of this hypothesis is proof that in England also the question has received special attention. As the dating of the letters of the captivity of Paul is of far-reaching consequence, not only for the historical representation of the Apostle's life but also for the understanding of his religious thought, as well as for the practical exposition of his letters by the preacher and teacher, the lively interest in the discussion of our hypothesis does not need ex-

planation. In the following article, I try to present the most important points of view, referring the reader in quest of fuller argument and proof to the literature, especially to my own monograph, *Die Gefangenschaft des Paulus in Ephesus und das Itinerar des Timotheus: Untersuchungen zur Chronologie des Paulus und der Paulusbriefe* (Neutestamentliche Forschungen, herausgegeben von Otto Schmitz: 1. Reihe, Heft 3, Gütersloh 1925), the writing of which I owe to the inspiration of my teacher, Adolf Deissmann.

We must, first of all, bring under consideration the circumstances ot the origin of the letter to the Philippians. It is clear that we must observe the methodological principle that only when the hitherto accepted belief that Philippians was composed in Rome (or Caesarea) is disproved can its composition in Ephesus be supposed: It is not admissible to set aside the tradition regarding the writing of Philippians without reason for doing so, just as in any case it is undesirable to frame new hypotheses when there are no difficulties in a current tradition that make a new hypothesis requisite. For this reason the methodological justification of the hypothesis that Philippians was written in Ephesus must needs lie in the improbability or impossibility of the letter being composed in Rome (or Caesarea). The more convincingly the impossibility of the dating of the letter from Rome (or Caesarea) can be shewn, the stronger becomes the hypothesis of its dating from Ephesus. Therefore the question must be put and answered:

A. *On what grounds may it be supposed Philippians was not written in Rome (or Caesarea)?*

I. There is no evidence which decisively or exclusively favours Rome (or Caesarea) as the place of composition.

(*a*) The letter itself gives no evidence as to the place of its origin. That 1 Corinthians was written in Ephesus emerges from its own plain statement (xvi 8), but Philippians gives no similar self-witness.

(*b*) The mention of the praetorium i 13 and of the slaves of Caesar iv 22, does not point, as has often been shewn, exclusively to Rome. There were praetoria elsewhere, e.g. in Jerusalem (Matt. xxvii 27) and Caesarea (Acts xxiii 35), and slaves of the imperial household were to be found throughout the whole Empire.

(*c*) Ancient tradition does indeed date Philippians from Rome. Rome is stated as the place of writing in the postscripts to the letter in the MSS and in the Marcionite prologue to Philippians. But these statements must without doubt be traced to i 13 and iv 22 having been taken as referring to Rome, and cannot therefore be given the value of independent witness. Moreover, one may venture to say that they are not free from a suspicion of being inspired by a tendency of a definite kind. It would seem certain that the letters of Paul were collected at an early period, and first in the districts of the Apostle's missionary activities in Asia Minor or Corinth. But that the final, or what may be termed the canonical, collection took place in Rome may also be surmised. At this time the Roman Church was doubtless imbued with a strong interest in dating, as far as possible, the letters of this collection as from (and to) Rome. That such a tendency on the part of the Roman Church was not without influence on the formation of the canon, seems to be revealed in the uncertainty in the tradition of the Roman address of the epistle to the Romans and with regard even to the integrity of that letter itself. This influence is an element in the question to which attention has not yet been sufficiently directed. Such considerations diminish appreciably the value of the tradition that Rome was the place where Philippians was written.

(*d*) It has often been stated that the language of Philippians (and ot the Captivity-letters as a whole) differs from that of the other letters, and that in this letter the 'ageing' Paul is speaking. This argument is of an extremely dubious nature, as can be exemplified by numerous instances drawn from the wide field of universal literature; and examination of the individual phrases, that might seem to support it, renders it untenable. The epistles of Paul which have been preserved to us form so small a portion of his correspondence that we can frame from them no canon of diction. It is only, therefore, with the utmost caution that we can draw evidence from linguistic differences within the letters which have chanced to survive.

(*e*) The same consideration qualifies the statement that the content of Philippians (and of the Captivity-letters as a whole), so far as it reveals the religious and theological thought of the Apostle, differs in theological character from the rest of the letters of Paul and indicates a later stage of developement. This affirmation is based on the unjustifiable assumption that Pauline conceptions, from the period of the third missionary-journey onwards, must have undergone an 'evolution'. But this, again, cannot be established, as investigation of particular instances in question can shew. The fact that the whole extant correspondence of Paul is of a fragmentary nature, and that the few letters we possess from him are of an occasional kind (*Gelegenheitsschreiben*), precludes us from constructing a canon of Pauline theology by means of which an 'evolution' of his thoughts can be diagnosed. When his writings are subjected to examination, the thesis that in them there is and must be a uniform system of thought, does not secure judgement in its favour.

II. The following considerations are decidedly unfavourable to the view that Philippians was composed in Rome (or Caesarea):

(*a*) The letter discloses that before the time of writing there had been journeys between Philippi and the locus of its composition, and that for the period after its composition more journeys between Philippi and the place from which the letter was written are contemplated. In this connexion we must reflect that the distance between the two places has either already been travelled eight times, or is to be so; and if we compute the distance between Philippi and Rome (or Philippi and Caesarea) the impossibility of dating the letter from Rome (or Caesarea) becomes apparent. For even if the journeys between Philippi and Rome (or Caesarea) had followed close upon one another and had occupied the shortest possible time, they cannot be fitted into the scheme of Pauline chronology. Further, the 'soon' of ii 19, ii 24 seems to signify that it is not any very great distance which the author of the letter has in view. This argument, which is based on the data of distance as being decisively against the composition of Philippians in Rome, is represented by Deissmann in his *Zur ephesinischen Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus* (in 'Anatolian Studies' presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay, Manchester, 1923, pp. 121–127).

(*b*) The projected travels and missionary plans of Paul, from the time of the third missionary-journey, had the West in view. Acts xix 22 and xxiii 11 prevent us from assuming that Paul, while imprisoned in Caesarea, expressed his purpose, in the event of obtaining freedom, of journeying not to Rome but to Philippi (or indeed, if we take account of Colossians and Philemon, into the interior of Asia Minor). Also, altogether apart from the question whether Paul could accomplish the journey to Spain, Rom. xv 24 renders it impossible for us to believe that Paul while in prison in Rome expressed the intention of proceeding, if freed, not to Spain but to Philippi (or the interior of Asia Minor). This objection loses, of course, some of its significance if the possibility of a second Roman imprisonment be postulated, and if the notes which appear in the Pastoral epistles be held to be genuine: but it does not even then fall to the ground.

(*c*) Phil. ii 12 indicates that Paul, when he wrote the letter, had only once been among the Christians in Philippi, namely at the founding of the Church there. At the time, however, of the imprisonments in Caesarea and Rome he must have been at least twice, if not three times, in Philippi (Acts xx 1; cf. 2 Corinthians, as also clearly Acts xx 6).

(*d*) Also from Phil. iv 15, 16 it appears that Paul, after the foundation of the Church on the second missionary-journey, had not been again in Philippi, and therefore that the recollections of this time are the last and are yet comparatively fresh.

Thus, since nothing in the evidence we have before us points particularly or exclusively to Rome (or Caesarea), but much on the contrary particularly away from Rome (or Caesarea), the methodological justification of the hypothesis that Philippians was written in Ephesus during the third missionary-journey, is clearly brought to light, and we can now turn to the second question.

B. *Why must we regard Philippians as written from Ephesus?*

I. Before submitting reasons for the composition of Philippians in Ephesus, we may attempt to remove the objections to this supposition. What are these objections? Are they valid?

(*a*) It is true that Acts does not report an imprisonment of Paul in Ephesus or any judicial trial of the Apostle there. But the narrative of Acts of the three years' stay of Paul in Ephesus is certainly fragmentary, and it would appear as if Luke had definite reason for passing over this period with relative brevity. Also the account of St Paul summoning the elders of the Church of Ephesus (Acts xx 17) to Miletus, and the avoidance on his journey on that occasion of a visit to Ephesus, suggest that in this city difficulties had confronted him which were both more considerable and of another sort than Acts xix communicates. The objection that St Luke may have indeed omitted less important events, but that he could hardly have left the fact of an imprisonment in Ephesus unmentioned, is not one that can be urged with effect. For the list of trials and sufferings, 2 Cor. xi 23, which Paul experienced on his missionary campaigns demonstrates that Acts leaves us widely uninformed of unfortunate experiences of the Apostle. The use of the plural 'imprisonments' in xi 23 of 2 Corinthians, a letter written before the imprisonments in Casearea and Rome, proves that Paul was more often in captivity than Acts relates. According to the First Epistle of Clement v 6 he was 'seven times in bonds'.

(*b*) As little as the speech and outlook of Philippians speak for the composition of the letter in Rome (or Caesarea), so little do they speak against its composition in the time of the third missionary-journey (cf. A. I, *d*, *e*).

II. What can be said on behalf of the composition of Philippians in Ephesus?

(*a*) The journeys which the letter presupposes (cf. A. II, *a*), if we consider the distance to be covered as Philippi to Ephesus, are possible (cf. Acts xx 6–17).

(*b*) In Ephesus there was assuredly a praetorium, though its site has not yet been established by excavation with certainty.

(*c*) In Ephesus were stationed, as can be proved, slaves of the imperial household.

(*d*) When Paul was in Ephesus he had only been once in Philippi (cf. A. II, *c* and *d*), namely, when the Church there had been founded.

(*e*) The Marcionite prologue to Colossians states: *ergo apostolus iam ligatus scribit eis ab Epheso.*

(*f*) The Muratorian Canon places the letters Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians next after 1 Corinthians.

(*g*) A watch-tower which yet remains as part of the city-wall of pre-Christian times is called in the local tradition 'Paul's prison'.

(*h*) 1 Cor. xv 32 reports that, in Ephesus, Paul was in danger of being condemned to fight with wild beasts. The literal interpretation of the technical expression 'to fight with beasts' cannot be gainsaid. (Cf. C. R. Bowen, 'I fought with beasts in Ephesus', *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, vol. xlii, Parts I and II, 1923, pp. 59–68.)

(*i*) The historical, personal, and local data of Philippians fit into the period of the third missionary-journey strikingly well. Particularly illuminating is the equation, Acts xix 22 = 1 Cor. iv 17, xvi 10 = Phil. ii 19. In all these passages the reference is to one and the same journey of Timothy, the route being Ephesus—Macedonia (Philippi)—Corinth—Ephesus. Equally clear also is the equation, Acts xix 21 = 1 Cor. xvi 3–9 = Phil. ii 24, where the reference is to one and the same journey by the route Ephesus—Macedonia—Corinth—Jerusalem. The accomplishment of this journey is recorded by Acts xx 1 f, 2 Cor. ii 12, 13, vii 5 f, viii 1, and Rom. xv 25, 26. Further combinations, for which I refer the reader to my book, cannot be indicated in this short sketch, but the above passages provide opportunity for decision as to the possibility of placing Philippians in the period of the third missionary-journey.

The reasons for and against the Ephesus-hypothesis have naturally different degrees of cogency. Those which count less clearly in its favour are, however, supported by those which are admittedly more telling, among which I would especially emphasize those marked B. II, *a* and *i*. But what now are the consequences of our dating Philippians from Ephesus? Paul was in captivity in Ephesus. This imprisonment presupposes a judicial process. Since Paul, in the event of his condemnation, would have had to fight with beasts, the charge against him must have been one which had attached to it this kind of punishment. Presumably the charge was that of exciting to the breach of the peace and was preferred against Paul by the Jews. The Jews of Thessalonica, Acts xvii 6, also bring this accusation against Paul. In the course of the trial at Ephesus it comes to light nevertheless that Paul has been accused on account of his Christian faith and his missionary success, and that the specific charge against him of disturbance of the peace of the realm cannot be substantiated (Phil. i 12, 13). The judicial proceedings then took, for the Apostle, a fortunate turn, as they had in a similar case in Corinth (Acts xviii 14, 15). Philippians was written at a time when Paul was still under arrest, but could count upon release and entertain plans of journeys for the near future (Phil. ii 19 f, 25, 26). 1 Corinthians is written when Paul is again free and can look back upon the danger that had threatened him, of being sentenced *ad bestias*, as upon a peril of the recent past well known to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv 32). That Paul had not been sentenced to this punishment, is evident from the argument of 1 Cor. xv where it is not deliverance from the danger of death (for, as he remains alive, escape from the danger must be supposed) but the experience of such danger which alone can have the force of proof in the reasoning for a belief in a resurrection of the dead. If 1 Corinthians was written about Easter A.D. 55, then Philippians was composed about the middle or the end of the winter 54/55, and the imprisonment began in the autumn or winter of 54. With the Demetrius-riot (Acts xix 23 f) or the 'trouble' mentioned in 2 Cor. i 8 the trial of S. Paul has no connexion.

With regard to the other Captivity-epistles, the placing of them in the period of an imprisonment in Ephesus is not without difficulty. But for Philippians so far as I can judge, the proof of its composition at that time can be adduced with a fair degree of assurance. The significance of this dating is that the reports of the third missionary-journey, and especially of the three years' stay in Ephesus, thus receive a considerable enrichment, and new light from the new situation and circumstances is thrown on the interpretation of the letters of this period.

Further, for the solution of the question of the unity and origin of the Pastoral Epistles we are given a greater freedom of movement. The Pastorals would consequently be separated from all the other letters by an interval of time such as does not appear in the chronological connexion of the other letters. The character of the Pastoral Epistles as distinguished from the other epistles of Paul is, on our hypothesis, more easily explicable and intelligible than when, as hitherto, they were brought into close relationship of time with the Captivity-letters. Finally there is this additional result. If, with the exceptions of the Pastorals, all the letters of Paul which have been preserved to us, derive from the same period—for, as I believe, the letters to the Thessalonians also belong to the period of the third missionary-journey—in the biblical-theological exegesis of the conceptions of these letters we must proceed upon the supposition of their unity. Differences, for instance, in the eschatological ideas cannot any longer be explained as due to a 'developement', but must be regarded as disparate elements (*Spannungen*) which are present in the unity of the Apostle's religious concepts. The recognition of this fact is of the greatest importance, not only for the representation of the 'theology' of Paul, but also for the understanding of the Pauline religious thought in the evangel of the Christian Churches.

W. MICHAELIS.

WAS THE GOSPEL OF MARK WRITTEN IN LATIN?

THE question here posed is not so extravagant as it seems at first sight. It has been seriously asked by Dr P. L. Couchoud in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* for 1926, pp. 161–192, and it now appears in an English translation by M. S. Enslin, revised and enlarged by Dr Couchoud, in the *Crozer Quarterly* for Jan. 1928. The idea that Mark was originally written in Latin is not even contrary to tradition, for (as Couchoud points out) the Peshitta colophons at the end of the Gospel of Mark, followed by many (late) Greek MSS—and he might have added Ephraim's Commentary on the Diatessaron (*Moesinger*, p. 286),—assert that it was written in Latin. Dr Couchoud, it must be stated at once, recognizes in Codex Bobiensis (*k*) a surviving fragment of the lost original.

I think it not out of place, before examining Dr Couchoud's arguments and examples, to consider the thesis from a general point of view, whether it be admissible or conceivable. What bearing would it have, were it accepted, on 'the Synoptic problem'? Forty years ago, when most critics believed in 'Ur-Marcus', or in a written 'Common Synoptic Tradition', Dr Couchoud's thesis would have hardly obtained a hearing. Notwithstanding continual and characteristic variations the amount of Greek words and phrases common to Matthew, Mark, and Luke makes it quite clear that they have a common Greek source, and further, that common source must have been very much like our Greek Gospel of Mark. If then Mark were composed in Latin, the common source, the Ur-Marcus, must be a translation from the Latin, which seems absurd. But the theory of an 'Ur-Marcus' is now, very properly, out of favour. The 'common tradition of the Synoptic Gospels' has resolved itself into our Greek Mark. 'Mark', we now believe, as used by Matthew and Luke, did not differ from the text of B or Westcott and Hort more than B differs from D or W. If the original was in Latin, these differences, i. e. the differences between B and D and W and 'Mark' as known to Matthew and to Luke, can be explained as due to slight differences in more or less independent translations.

Yet not quite. For there is too much agreement between our Greek MSS, between (let us say) B and D and W, not to make it clear that they are all forms of the same 'translation'.

Wellhausen, who made out quite a plausible case for regarding the Gospel of Mark as a translation from the Aramaic, never suggested that Matthew and Luke had used this Aramaic, or independent Greek translations from the Aramaic. No, he supposed that they used our Greek Mark, and that this use of Mark in Greek is why so many passages of Matthew and Luke agree word for word, not only sense for sense. The same must be true if Mark be regarded as a translation from a Latin original. It must be the Greek translation of this Latin original that was used by Matthew and by Luke.

Further, the Gospel of Mark, as every critic knows, must have had a perilous career in its early days. Even if γάρ may end a Greek sentence, it still seems to most people that the Gospel could not have originally ended at xvi 8, so that what we have is mutilated at the end. But it was this mutilated form that was known to Matthew and Luke.[1] The Greek 'translation' therefore was mutilated—Why? Because it was a translation from a Latin text that was already mutilated.

This is the only form of Dr Couchoud's hypothesis that is discutable. As is well known, *k* itself is one of the prime witnesses to the shorter text of Mark. It has no sign of [Mk] xvi 9–20, as it ends this Gospel with xvi 8 followed by a single short sentence (the so-called Shorter Conclusion) designed to finish off the mutilated text. The mutilation, therefore, occurred in the Latin, before the Greek translation was made. It is a curious omission in Dr Couchoud's work that he does not discuss the end of Mark, whether we are to regard the text of *k* there as original, i. e. that the work as originally conceived ended with the Shorter Conclusion and that what is missing in Greek is only some thirty words in all, or whether both *k* and the best Greek tradition attest a form ending at xvi 8 through the loss of an ending of unknown length and character. In this latter case the text of *k* may be regarded as an attempt to provide for the missing peroration by an addition which afterwards found its way into a local text current for a time in Egypt, i. e. that represented by L and Ψ and their allies.

In this form, then, Dr Couchoud's theory that the original Gospel of Mark was a Latin work, not unlike *k* in text, is not excluded by what we know of the early literary history of that Gospel. We may, if we like, imagine to ourselves that after the troubles of the Neronian persecution and the settlement of the Flavian Dynasty the Christians of

---

[1] See Streeter *Four Gospels* pp. 175, 300.

Rome found a mutilated Latin sketch of the ministry of Jesus—was it perhaps the author's autograph?—which was translated, mutilated as it was at the end, into Greek, and so became the basis for the more comprehensive works of Matthew and Luke. A few copies of the Latin may have been made, which in their turn became the parents of a Latin Gospel text in the region where a Latin Bible was most required, viz. Carthage and North Africa.

But does the proof suffice? Does the actual text of *k*, and of the more or less revised and sophisticated text of its near relation *e*, suggest the priority of this 'original' Latin as compared with our Greek? The odd thing is that it is very hard to come to a decision, for most of the evidence is ambiguous, or can be interpreted either way. If a passage or phrase be compared in the Greek and Latin, and one is found to be obscure and awkward while the other is perspicuous, it may be said that the perspicuous one is the original and that the obscurity and awkwardness of the other was due to the mistakes or incompetence of a translator: alternatively we may say that the obscure and awkward text is original (or relatively original, as due to faithful transmission of partly misunderstood tradition), while the perspicuous text is due to a translator's paraphrastic tendencies, in order to produce 'sense'. A couple of characteristic instances may be given.

Mk ix 50 (Couchoud, p. 13).[1]

bonum est sal, sed si sal fatuum, fatuum fuerit in quod illud condistis.

Καλὸν τὸ ἅλασ· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλασ ἄναλον γένηται, ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε;

Dr Couchoud translates the Latin (which he has partly taken from Hans v. Soden's reconstruction of *k*): 'Salt is good, but if the salt is tasteless everything will be tasteless in which you put it.' On this he remarks (p. 15) that 'the Latin is in perfect harmony with the context. The tasteless salt makes tasteless everything it touches, as the offending hand, foot, eye corrupt the whole body'.

This is all very well, but ought we not to be guided in the interpretation of Mk ix 50 by the parallel Lk xiv 34 = Matt v 13? This is independent of Mark, a 'Q' passage, if ever there be one. One may suppose it was a proverbial phrase often used by Jesus: if the source of purification be foul, what will purify the source? Therefore, attractive as M. Couchoud's new Saying of Jesus is at first sight, there is a critical difficulty in accepting it.

Moreover, it has a rather intangible form. The Latin quoted above is not the text of *k*, but an emendation. And even so it is not enough for M. Couchoud, who says in a note (p. 14): 'The original text was doubtless: *si sal fatuum* FUERIT, *fatuum* ERIT . . ., and he takes *in quod* to mean *id in quod*. But this is still not quite satisfactory, for *condistis* comes from *condire* to 'pickle' or 'spice': you do not pickle salt in meat, you pickle meat with salt. To get M. Couchoud's meaning it should read *fatuum erit quod illo condistis*, i. e. 'that will be tasteless which you have seasoned with bad salt'. Or did M. Couchoud take *condistis* as an error in *k* for *condidistis* (from *condere*)? The Greek is ἀρτύσετε (i. e. *condietis*).

---

[1] Add 34 in each case to get the pages of the *Crozer Quarterly*.

Now let us turn to *k* itself which has

BONUMEST·SALSETSISALSFATUM-	*end of page.*
FATUMFUER·INQUODILLUTCONDIS	Fol. 9 b *begins.*
TIS HABETISINUOBISPANEM· PACA	
TIESTOTEINILLAUICEM ETINDEPRO.	

I print four lines, so that my readers may be reminded of the terribly blundering ways of the scribe of *k*.[1] But the spacing tells us that he took *in quod illut condistis* as a separate clause, therefore probably as an interrogative. And as the reduplicated *fatum* (=*fatuum*) is the last and first words of a page the chance that it is nothing more than a scribe's error becomes very high indeed.

Somewhat similar in character is the passage from which Dr Couchoud starts (Mk. xiii 34–37, Couchoud, p. 5 f). We read

'As a man going on a journey left the house and gave to his servants authority, to each his own work, and to the door-keeper he commanded to watch, so watch (*sic uigilate*) for ye know not when . . . lest he find you sleeping; but what he (the man) said to one, I say to all of you.'

Here *k* has *sic uigilate* where the Greek has γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, and for the last words, where the Greek has ὃ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω, πᾶσιν λέγω· γρηγορεῖτε, *k* has (or virtually has, according to Couchoud)

quod autem uni dixit, omnibus uobis dico.

In reality *k* has *dixi* not *dixit*, but Dr Couchoud suggests that a *t* has been dropped by a Latin scribe. Accepting this correction for the moment, we get a continuous paragraph: '*As* a man left his home and told the porter to watch, *so* watch ye: what he said to the *one*, I say to *all* of you.'

This is really very nice and attractive. What is more, the text of *k* is in certain particulars sustained by subsidiary evidence. The use of *sic* for οὖν is attested by *e* (unfortunately not extant for the latter part of the passage), and also by *c*. The final 'watch!' is also omitted by *c*.

---

[1] It need hardly be remarked how grateful we ought to be that *k* is *not* a revised text. Had the scribe been more familiar with Christian diction many a valuable old reading would doubtless have been corrected away.

And the African Optatus has 'to one'—*quod uni ex uobis dico omnibus dico*—unfortunately without giving the context. But the *t* of M. Couchoud's *dixit* is otherwise unattested, and that is the one link which connects the word with the man of the simile rather than with Jesus Himself.

What of the ὡς at the beginning, which in the Greek is not answered by a corresponding clause with 'so' or 'in like manner'? Wellhausen considers it sufficient to remark 'In Semitic a principal sentence often begins with (the equivalent of) ὡς, meaning "It is as when"'.[1] I would rather compare it with the Semitic suppression of a too obvious apodosis, of which familiar examples are to be found in Dan. iii 15, Lk. xiii 9.[2] No one would ever maintain that the Gospel of Mark, whether first written down in Greek or Latin, was composed according to the rules of art as taught by schoolmasters ever since schools existed. It invites 'correction', but how effective it is! Let any one read rapidly aloud Mk. xiii 33–37 as it stands in Greek, with an emphasis on γρηγορῇ (for it is the key-word of the passage), but without stopping to consider whether an apodosis has been expressed or only implied: I venture to think his hearers will not feel that the paragraph is 'vague and confused', or that 'an orderly little picture' has been 'broken up into three fragments', as M. Couchoud maintains. No, they will be moved to keep awake! I find it difficult to believe that anything so moving and so impressive—i. e. when declaimed, not just analysed—can be the result of unskilful translation. A translator, on the other hand, or an adapter (such as Matthew or Luke), is bound to be an analyst, unless he simply copies word for word. So the Latin translator of Mark turned οὖν into *sic*, while Luke (Lk. xxi 34–36) rewrites the whole passage.

This notice is already too long, except for one or two scattered remarks. When on p. 34 M. Couchoud says 'The Latin Mark occupies a central position so far as affinity for the Greek texts is concerned' he seems to forget that 'the Latin Mark' here means codex *k*. It would be different if we had a series of Latin MSS which agreed together. As it is, *k* occupies a place on a plane with other primary authorities (B, D, W, syr.*S*); you find B *k*, *k* syr.*S*, &c., against the rest, but also B D, B syr.*S* &c., against the rest, and every other binary combination. The incidents of translation are not sufficient to explain this: nothing explains it but the recognition that in early times there were extensive and capricious variations in the text of Mark in every language in which it was extant.

On p. 21 M. Couchoud refers to my discussion of Mk. viii 32 in

---

[1] *Das Evangelium Marci* (ed. of 1909), p. 107.

[2] See *J. T. S.* xxviii 275.

J. T. S. ii 112. Here καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει corresponds to *et cum fiducia sermonem loqui* in *k*, attested also by syr.*S* and by the Arabic Tatian. Whichever reading be original, the presence of the *k*-text in Syriac demands explanation. Must we not, if Mark were originally written in Latin and *k* be a descendant of this original Latin, regard the variant ἐλάλει for λαλεῖν as a *Greek* variant, from which the Syriac (a sub-translation from the Greek) has escaped? The other alternative is extremely complicated: we have to suppose an original Latin Harmony made from the three *Greek* Gospels and the *Latin* Mark, that the Diatessaron was made from this Latin text, and that syr.*S* here has followed the Diatessaron against the Greek. Some of these steps are, in my opinion, not improbable in themselves. As readers of this JOURNAL may remember, I believe that the genesis of the Syriac Diatessaron took place something in this way.[1] But the whole of the evidence which makes the priority of a Latin Diatessaron probable points to its Latin text having been in language and phraseology 'European' and remote from *k*. In the evidence which points to the originality of the Latin Diatessaron there is nothing which points to the extracts from Mark having been made from a text different in character from that of the other Gospels.

M. Couchoud does not refer to Mk xv 15, where τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι corresponds to *satisfacere* in the Vulgate. This is not carelessness, but arises from the fact that every extant Old-Latin MS at this point (viz. D *ff k* and *r*) omit the whole clause. Here *a b e f i* and *q* are all missing: the late mixed text *c* agrees with the Vulgate, but it is known to have many Vulgate readings. Probably the omission is a mere piece of carelessness in some early 'Western' text, but as it stands in the Greek it has always been reckoned as a striking Latinism. In Hermas (*Sim.* vi 5, 5) τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῶν actually occurs—an early Christian writing in Greek at Rome. So also was Mark, according to the ordinary view. It seems to me that this is the explanation of most of M. Couchoud's examples.[2]

As I have tried to explain in the beginning of this notice, the hypothesis that Mark was originally written in Latin is not altogether beyond the region of possibility. It explains better than any other view its preservation and dissemination in a mutilated form. But M. Couchoud's examples, interesting and attractive as is the way in which he puts them forward, do not, in my opinion, prove his case: some of them indeed rather weaken it. How strange it is, that the Gospel which more than any other seems to have been written by one who thought in Aramaic should be that in which Latin influence should be so strong!

---

[1] See *J. T. S.* xxv 128.

[2] In passing I would like to call attention to the fact that *cena pura* survives in the Sardinian dialect in the form *Kendbura* as the name of Friday. This interesting fact is quoted by Couchoud (p. 43, note 45^{c}) from D. S. Blondheim's very learned investigation called *Les parlers judéo-romans et la vetus latina* (Paris, 1925), p. lx.

F. C. BURKITT.

A NOTE ON ROM. VI 17, 18.

THERE is no real difficulty about the Greek text of these verses, which may be given at once for reference:

> *Χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς, ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ.*

The general sense is clear; they were slaves to sin, but now they have been freed from the mastery of sin and enslaved to righteousness. For this the Apostle gives thanks. Slavery was an institution so familiar in biblical times that figures are taken from it which in our day we should be inclined to avoid; St Paul himself, for example, can find no better word to express his entire devotion to the service of Christ than to call himself His 'slave', though we soften the expression to 'servant'.

The text of the Revised Version translates the above verses as follows:—

> But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness.

The margin offers the following alternative: 'that ye were servants of sin, but ye became obedient.' It also gives 'pattern' as an alternative to 'form', and 'bond-servants' as an alternative to 'servants'.

It will be observed that text and margin alike suppose that the clause, 'ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered', refers to the time *after* conversion. And that is the generally accepted translation and interpretation of the passage. It is unnecessary to discuss individual translations: the Authorized Version, the Geneva, Cranmer, Tyndale, Rheims, 'Wiclif' versions (all these in *The English Hexapla*, edited under the Greek text of Scholz by Bagster), the Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt translations—all agree in this. So also does *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures*; for although I had doubts from the beginning, the weight of authority was so overwhelming on the other side that I had not the courage to contradict it. It should be observed, however, that St Jerome's Vulgate is really neutral, rather translating the *words*, as is so often the case with ancient translations, than committing itself to a theory of the meaning. In Dr White's little edition the text runs as follows:—

> Gratias autem Deo, quod fuistis serui peccati, oboedistis autem ex corde in eam formam doctrinae, in qua traditi estis. Liberati autem a peccato, serui facti estis iustitiae.

Apart from details of spelling, the modern Clementine Vulgate only differs from this in reading *quam* for *qua*, a manifest improvement.

The more I reflect upon it, the more convinced I feel that the clause, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς, refers to the Christians' state *before* conversion, and I would now translate:

> Thanks be to God that whereas ye were slaves to sin, and had given hearty obedience to that form of teaching whereunto ye had been delivered, yet ye were freed from sin, and enslaved to justness.

(I may explain that we use the old word 'justness' in the *Westminster Version* to keep the etymological connexion with 'justify' &c., while avoiding the legal connotation of 'justice'.)

There are two main arguments for the rendering I propose. In the first place, the antithesis, which requires ἐλευθερωθέντες as the contrast to δοῦλοι, is set askew by ὑπηκούσατε, which would begin the antithetic clause with a fresh example of subjection, and thus take the point out of ἐλευθερωθέντες.

The second argument is the use of the word παρεδόθητε. The verb παραδίδωμι ('deliver up') is used nineteen times in the Pauline epistles, and practically always of 'delivering up' to something evil, as in the other five passages of this very epistle. The only exceptions in the Pauline epistles are 1 Cor. xi 2, 23; xv 3, in which three passages it is used of 'delivering' traditional teaching, and in 1 Cor. xv 24, where it is used of Christ 'delivering up' the kingdom to God the Father. Thus we may say that it is not in St Paul's style to speak of persons being 'delivered up' to anything good. Nor indeed is it in the style of the New Testament as a whole; the word is common in the gospels and the Acts, but the only examples in the New Testament of persons being 'delivered up' to anything good are in Acts xiv 26; xv 40.

It may help to make the matter clearer if I take notice of three existing translations of these verses. That of the Revised Version I have already given. It shews that it is taking the δέ after ὑπηκούσατε to give the main antithesis by the use of 'whereas' in the text, and of 'but' in the margin; while the δέ after ἐλευθερωθέντες it simply translates by 'and'. It is of course an interpretation (such as in practice one must continually be offering) rather than *mere* translation to begin the antithetic statement with the earlier rather than the later δέ. It is also an interpretation to translate ὑπηκούσατε itself by 'ye *became* obedient', thus giving the aorist a definitely inceptive sense, whereas the Greek of itself merely signifies 'point-time', an action of shorter or longer duration in the past, viewed, however, as one act and not as a series of acts.

It may be urged that the transition from the imperfect of ἦτε to the aorist of ὑπηκούσατε naturally signifies an abiding state now interrupted by a single act; the aorist, it may be said, must not be given the sense of an imperfect. Nevertheless it should be observed that this aorist finds a close parallel, in the same context and with the same meaning, in παρεστήσατε in the nineteenth verse, a parallel itself emphasized by a recurrence of δοῦλοι ἦτε in the twentieth verse. There too we might well have expected an imperfect rather than an aorist. What appears to me most likely is that both these aorists *are* inceptive, but to the state represented by δοῦλοι ἦτε, and with the sense of an English pluperfect. This sense often belongs to the aorist in Greek, because of the peculiar sense of the Greek perfect and pluperfect, representing primarily permanent condition in present or past, but as the result of previous action. Hence pluperfect 'point-time', such as is required by the inceptive sense, falls to the aorist. The sense therefore appears to be, 'Ye were slaves of sin, owing to the hearty obedience ye had come to pay . . . As ye had offered your members as slaves . . . so now offer . . . For when as a result of that offering ye were slaves of sin.'

The Authorized Version, put into modern spelling and one paragraph, reads thus:—

> But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin: but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine, which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.

Against the words, 'which was delivered you', there is a marginal note, 'Gr. whereto ye were delivered'. And well there might be; for this attempt to convert into a personal passive the active meaning already mentioned, of 'delivering' traditional teaching, will not bear examination, as the Revisers evidently realized.

As a last example I may take one of the most notable of modern translations, that of Dr Moffatt, who renders:—

> Thank God, though you did serve sin, you have rendered wholehearted obedience to what you were taught under the rule of faith; set free from sin, you have passed into the service of righteousness.

Now it is evident that παρεδόθητε does not mean 'you were taught', though in this translation Dr Moffatt may have been influenced somewhat by the Authorized Version; nor does τύπον mean 'rule', nor διδαχῆς 'of faith'. This is in fact a paraphrase, giving the translator's general impression of the passage. How far, indeed, he is prepared to go in such paraphrase (and highly controversial paraphrase at that) may be seen from his rendering Christ's words at the Last Supper by, 'it (or in Luke, This) means my body'. The word διδαχή is neutral, being used of teaching good or bad; for the bad sense see, for example, Matt. xvi 12; Acts v 28; Heb. xiii 9; Rev. (Apoc.) ii 14–15. The word τύπος is used in the somewhat unusual but obvious sense of 'form' or 'kind', of which there is no other clear example in the New Testament; but we may refer to Plato's *Republic* p. 387 c, near the beginning of the third book, ἄλλα ὅσα τούτου τοῦ τύπου ὀνομαζόμενα.

Perhaps some prejudice will be felt against the translation which I am advocating from the fact that the words ἐκ καρδίας, 'from the heart', are used, which might be thought almost necessarily to imply what is good. But a very little study of the use of the word in the New Testament will dispel this idea. It may suffice to refer to Matt. xv 18–19; Mark vii 21–22: all manner of vices are said to proceed from the heart. It must be remembered that to a large extent the psychological connotation (so to speak) of the physical organs has moved upward; Holy Scripture often speaks of the heart where we should rather say there was question of the head, and it mentions the bowels where we should find it more natural to allude to the heart.

C. LATTEY.

P.S.—I should wish to add (accepting a suggestion made to me) that τύπος διδαχῆς appears to refer more especially to the Mosaic Law, mentioned in the context both before (Rom. vi 15) and after (vii 1). This would tend to confirm the view that a large proportion of the Roman Christians were Jews. The gentiles among them, however, are directly addressed in Rom. xi 13.

ST MATTHEW xxvi 50

I HAVE lately came across two passages, which seem to me to throw a great light on the meaning of this disputed passage. But before dealing with them let me give the evidence for the text and the current interpretations of it (chiefly from A. H. McNeile *The Gospel according to St Matthew*, 1915).

Greek ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει Eus. D. E. Chrys. and a few less important MSS.
ἐφ' ὅ ℵ A B C D etc.
ἑταῖρε after πάρει D, Lat. vers. a c f 𝔖 sin. pesh Ephr$^{\mathrm{dia}}$ Diat$^{\mathrm{ar}}$.

Latin versions ad quod venisti
and so 𝔖 sin.
Vulg. ad quid; and so Ephr. and probably 𝔖 sin (Burkitt).
Diat$^{\mathrm{ar}}$ and 𝔖 pesh. assume an ellipse 'Was it for this thou camest?'
The A.V. translates 'Friend, wherefore art thou come?'

The R.V. 'Friend, *do* that for which thou art come', in accordance with the practice, as McNeile says, of 'most writers' who 'supply some such word as ποίησον'. McNeile says 'Possibly ἐφ' ὅ, τι (= δι' ὅ, τι) "wherefore" should be read, τι having fallen out before π'.

I cannot myself believe that ὅς can ever be used as a direct interrogative, and in this belief I am supported by Blass, *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, trans. by Henry St John Thackeray, 1905, p. 176, 'The employment of ὅστις or even of ὅς in a direct question is quite incredible, except that ὅ, τι appears to be used as an abbreviation for τί ὅ, τι *why*, St Mark ix 11 et al ...' So Stallbaum says on Plat. Rep. 559 A 'ὅς semper finitum est, referturque ad certam aliquam rem vel personam: τίς quaerit de eo quod est infinitum atque incertum. Ex quo patet alterum cum altero non potuisse commutari.' To the same effect Lobeck *Phryn.* p. 57, Moulton *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 93.

Of the Fathers Chrysostom (quoted by Blass *Beitr. zur. Förd. Chr. Theol.* fourth year, fourth part, p. 45) says (*in Matt.* p. 793 B) μετὰ ... τὸ δεῖξαι τὴν ἰσχὺν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ (in ref. to St John xviii 4 seq.) τότε λοιπὸν συνεχώρησεν which Blass says implies an imperative, and so conjectures αἶρε or ἑταῖρε αἶρε (van der Valk ἔπαιρε); but the likelihood of this conjecture is weakened by the fact, that (*vide* sup.) ἑταῖρε in many authorities *follows* πάρει. Chrysostom's words certainly imply an imperative, but not necessarily expressed. Blass also compares dub-Chrys. *de prod-Judae* vol. ii p. 723 A B πλήρωσον τὰς κακὰς συνθήκας, which conveys the same implication. Isid. Pel. ap. Cramer *cat. in Matt.* p. 226, 9–10, apparently regards the sentence as a direct question, and so clearly Theophylact *in loc.*

When I was working at the *Acts of Carpus, Papylus, and Agathonica* for a translation of some Acts of the early martyrs published by the Oxford Press I came on a phrase precisely similar to that of Matt. xxvi 50—ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφ' ὃ πάρειμι (§ 44 *Acts of Carpus* etc. Knopf, *Ausgewählte Märtyreracten*; Harnack, *Die Acten des Karpus* etc., Text. und Unters. 3, 3 f, 440–454). It is said by Agathonica, who appears, according to the account as it now stands, to have given herself up to martyrdom. Duchesne, however (*Early Hist. of the Church*, Eng. trans. vol. i p. 193 note), believes that something has dropped out, and that she was really arrested with the two others. The crowd have been shouting, 'Have pity on your son'. She replies that God will look after him—ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφ' ὃ πάρειμι. She then proceeds to cast off her outer garment and clasp the stake. Harnack translates 'Wherefore am I here?', but, apart from the grammatical difficulty, the rendering 'I (emphatic, contrasted with my son) must do that for which I am here' makes much better sense: the context requires action and is followed by action. Here, as in St Matthew, there is a variant ἐφ' ᾧ, but this is of no importance, ἐπί with the dat. often signifies purpose, though not so often as ἐπί with the acc.

When my book was going through the press a reader mentioned, in a note on this passage, that he had seen in a private collection a beaker of the first century with the inscription ΕΥΦΡΑΙΝΟΥ ΕΦ Ο ΠΑΡΕΙ (I asked for further information, but was told that the owner did not wish its whereabouts to be known). He translated 'Enjoy yourself[, which is] what you are here for'; but the sense may just as well be 'Enjoy yourself. Do that for which you are here' (if we had not the other examples to compare it with, we might translate 'Enjoy yourself on that for which you are here'). The evidence, very strong otherwise, for the sentence in St Matthew being elliptical and not interrogative becomes in the light of these additional passages conclusive. Moreover thus understood this sentence has a remarkable congruence with that other in St John (xiii 27) 'That thou doest, do quickly'.

One other point. The elliptical character of the phrase, its vagueness, and its occurrence in the same form in three entirely different contexts suggests that it is a colloquialism. The nearest illustration in English that I can think of is 'What you will', but numerous other instances similar in their vagueness and universality of application will occur to any one ('your turn', 'I am up against it', etc.). If so, it may be compared with other expressions of our Lord, 'What have I to do with thee?' (St John ii 4), 'Thou sayest' (St Luke xxiii 3), and His use of homely proverbs, 'Physician, heal thyself', 'the camel and the needle's eye'. The retention of this vivid Greek phrase by St Matthew alone would bear on the question of the relative authority of that Gospel, and even of the language in which it was originally written. If my conjecture is right, there ought to be other examples of this use, which I hope other correspondents may be able to supply.

E. C. E. Owen.

PROPHECY AND THE SABBATH.

(A note on the teaching of Jeremiah.)

The Sabbath is mentioned only once in the book of Jeremiah, but the passage is a striking one (Jer. xvii 19–27). In the dark days at the end of the seventh century B.C. the Prophet is represented as promising victory to kings and prosperity to Jerusalem on the one condition that the Sabbath be hallowed 'to do no work therein'. But it should be noted that one particular kind of work is in the author's mind. He is not possessed with a general notion of defending the observance of the Sabbath, but he has in mind a particular form of Sabbath breaking: 'Bear no burden on the sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden (*vv.* 21, 22). . . . If ye shall diligently hearken to bring in no burden (*v.* 24) . . . then shall there enter in . . . kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, . . . and this city shall be inhabited for ever (*v.* 25). . . . But if ye will not hearken unto me . . . not to bear a burden and enter in at the gates of Jerusalem on the sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces (ארמנות) of Jerusalem' (*v.* 27).

On this passage Giesebrecht (in Nowack's *Handkommentar*, 1907) writes: 'This piece is pronounced not genuine by Stade, Kuenen, and Cornill, and by the last two it is ascribed to a contemporary of Ezra and Nehemiah, who shared their view'. [See Neh. xiii 15–22.] Kuenen remarks: 'The one-sided emphasizing of the observance of the Sabbath, which represents the whole future of the people as dependent upon it, must strike one as strange in the mouth of Jeremiah'. And so the nine verses are printed in very small type in Giesebrecht's learned commentary on the prophet. It is treated as 'unecht'.

Such, no doubt, was the view also of A. B. Davidson, though it is not expressly stated in his article 'Jeremiah' in Hastings's *D.B.* 'The lawbook', he writes, 'little satisfied the prophetic idealism. Jeremiah seeks to draw men's minds away from all that was external—sacrifices, temple, ark, and lawbook—to that which was inward and real. Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart (Jer. iv 4).' Elsewhere in the same article Davidson specifies certain passages (xvii 19–27 among them) which were not incorporated with the prophecies of Jeremiah until 'the third stage' of the history of the growth of the book.

Further, Sir G. A. Smith in his *Jeremiah* (Baird Lectures for 1922) describes xvii 19–27 as 'an exhortation to keep the Sabbath, . . . which is probably post-exilic'. On the other hand Professor Rothstein of Münster in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift des A. T.'s* (1922) pronounces in favour of the genuineness of the passage as a whole, though he finds some interpolations (e.g. *vv.* 23, 26) in it. He rightly points out that the Sabbath ordinance is something more than a merely ritual law. The Sabbath rest was the poor man's privilege, but unwelcome to the rich (Amos viii 5).

In discussing the 'genuineness' of this passage we need say but little on the subject of style. The book of Jeremiah is not as such the work of the prophet himself, and in form it must owe much to Baruch the scribe (Jer. xxxvi 1–7, 32; xlv 1–5). But it may be said that a good parallel to Jer. xvii 19–27 is found in xxii 1–5. The decisive phrases are in *vv.* 3, 4:—

'Execute ye judgement and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor: and do no wrong, do no violence, to the stranger, the fatherless, nor the widow, neither shed innocent blood in this place. For if ye do this thing indeed, then there shall enter in by the gates of this house kings sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, he, and his servants, and all his people.' Oppression is the sin which looms largest in the eye of the Prophet.

Both xxii 1–5 and xvii 19–27 are found in the Greek recension of the book of Jeremiah, as well as in MT, but neither passage in its form suggests to us the mind of Jeremiah. Can that prophetic hater of war have held out such a reward as that kings and princes riding in chariots and on horses should enter the gates of Jerusalem? This is a picture of the return of kings from victorious war. It would suit the time of Jeremiah, but it is surely alien from his mind. It might conceivably come from Baruch the scribe, for Baruch cherished worldly ambition (Jer. xlv 5).

But the question before us is one of matter, the matter of observance of the Sabbath. Are Kuenen and his supporters right in holding that Jeremiah could not have urged the observance of the Sabbath with the emphasis which is ascribed to him in xvii 19–27? Or, to put the question another way, Does A. B. Davidson's characterization of Jeremiah (which would be generally accepted) exclude the possibility that the Prophet presented such an ultimatum on Sabbath observance to his king and to his people?

Let us grant in full all that is asserted of the inwardness of the Prophet's teaching; but does it follow that we must in consistency allow that Jeremiah could not have spoken of the Sabbath as in xvii 21–27? Was there nothing 'inward' in that institution? At least it had an inward meaning for Ezekiel, Jeremiah's contemporary, who spoke of the Sabbath as a sign between JEHOVAH and Israel (Ezek. xx 12). Sabbath observance could be looked on by a fellow-prophet as a test of loyalty to JEHOVAH. The Israelite had the Sabbath as 'a gift' from his God: the heathen was without it. Would not Jeremiah as the champion of the One true God be also a champion of this distinguishing mark of the true religion? Sacrifice and temple and ark and lawbook were common to Israel and Egypt and Babylon—but *not* the Sabbath. Nothing has hitherto been reported on this subject from Egypt, and the 'Babylonian Sabbath' still remains a doubtful Sabbath. In the new edition (1926) of Hugo Gressmann's *Altorienta-*

lische Texte zum A T all that appears is a passage of fifteen lines with the non-committal title *Die sogenannten Sabbathvorschriften.* All that is quite clear in these *Vorschriften* is that the seventh, fourteenth, nineteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days of the month were unlucky. 'Ein Vorhaben auszuführen, ist (der Tag) nicht geeignet.' The Jewish Sabbath was something different.

The Sabbath would appeal to Jeremiah as a distinguishing mark of the true JEHOVAH-faith, but not only as such. The mind of the prophet was strictly just and his heart was very pitiful. To such a nature the injunction of rest on the seventh day would seem central in religion. It was indeed a charter for the labourer. Field labour was rigorously forbidden: *the ox and ass must rest.* The maidservant was to have respite from the heavy work of grinding the corn with the hand-mill. We may add that in the Deuteronomic form of the Fourth Commandment a prophetic note is heard: 'And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt' (Deut. v 15). Jeremiah may have heard the Commandment in this form: in any case he would have been in sympathy with it.

His just spirit rose in wrath against any oppression of the labourer. No denunciation could be more severe than that which he aims at the masters ('princes' and others) who on a celebrated occasion broke the covenant of the servant (Jer. xxxiv 8–22). Hebrew servants were to serve for six years, and in the seventh year to go free. The princes first conformed to this regulation, being touched in conscience by their danger from the Chaldeans; and then, when the danger seemed to be past, they recalled their servants into servitude. For this act of treacherous oppression Jeremiah in the name of JEHOVAH devotes the princes 'to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine; and I will make you to be tossed to and fro among all the kingdoms of the earth'. The prophet who stood so stoutly for the law of the seventh year might surely stand up stoutly for the ordinance of the seventh day.

Not only the princes, but the king (Jehoiakim) also was an oppressor of the labourer and similarly earned Jeremiah's denunciation. Jehoiakim was engaged in building a lofty palace and in 'using his neighbour's service without wages' (Jer. xxii 13 ff). This service took no doubt the form of bearing burdens: sometimes it would consist of removing rubbish carried in baskets upon the head or shoulder (cf. Ps. lxxxi 6), at other times of bringing building material. But it was heavy manual work: there were no cranes in those days. The prophet's wrath rises to the height against Jehoiakim: 'He shall be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem.'

At a somewhat earlier date, we may suppose, Jeremiah goes to meet the king and to appeal for the observance of the Sabbath by the king.

The words of the address are purposely generalized, 'Hear ye . . . ye kings of Judah, and all Judah', but the message is meant in the first place for Jehoiakim himself. There are no generalities in the prophet's address: he goes straight to the root of the matter with the palace-building king. 'Bear no burden on the sabbath day'—no more carrying of stone or timber on the seventh day as on the six preceding days: let the labourer have a respite from this *corvée*, this heavy unpaid work. Jeremiah is not demanding that no one should cook a meal or go for a walk on the Sabbath, but that acknowledgement should be made that the labourer has a right to rest one day in seven. The prophet is not speaking as a ritualist, but as a would-be protector of the poor. This is surely Jeremiah himself: we need not look for some later prophet on whom to father this living discourse. The background of these verses is that of the middle period of Jeremiah's activity. An oppressive king is on the throne, Jerusalem still has 'palaces', and probably more great houses are in building, but danger is approaching, and the prophet sees it and gives warning of it. In form Jeremiah says, Keep the sabbath, but his matter is, Cease from oppression.

W. EMERY BARNES.

SOME HEBREW WORDS

IN the following notes an attempt is made to suggest possible, even probable, meanings or suitable affinities in the cognate languages for several uncertain words, which have either been wrongly explained or emended away, in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament.

The verb אבך has caused the interpreters difficulty in Isa. ix 17 (18), where the M. T. has וַיִּתְאַבְּכוּ גֵּאוּת עָשָׁן 'and they roll upward in thick pillars of smoke' (R.V.). The comparison of it with the Arab. أَبِكَ *carnosus fuit*[1] hardly yields a suitable sense; for the emphasis rests rather on the destruction of the thickets in fire and smoke (cp. LXX's συνκαταφάγεται) than on the rich fleshy fat of the smoke.[2] The Pesh., in using ܐܬܟܦܦ 'was twisted', appears to confuse התאבך with התהפך; but it is not necessary either to suppose that the Syr. translator read ויתהפכו and to alter the text accordingly.[3] May not the Heb. אבך be cognate with the Bab.-Ass. *abāku* 'to carry away'? In this case the M. T. is to be translated 'and they are carried away as' or 'in tall pillars of smoke'. The various meanings assigned to the Bab.-Ass.

---

[1] G.-B. p. 5; cp. Freytag *Lex. Ar.-Lat.*, vol. i p. 5; cp. Bab.-Ass. *apāqu* or *epēqu* 'to be massive' (Bezold *B. A. G.* p. 55).

[2] This interpretation goes back to Marwân ibn Janâḥ, who explains אבך of the تكاثف of trees (Neubauer *Marwân ibn Janâḥ's 'Book of Hebrew Roots'* p. 18).

[3] Cheyne *Isaiah* (in *S. B. O. T.*) p. 84.

abāku, of which the primary meaning seems to be 'to turn away' or 'divert' are 'to turn', 'to overthrow', 'to pour out', 'to place', 'to forgive', 'to buy', 'to carry away'.[1] These may be disentangled in the following way: (i) 'to carry away'; 'to forgive' (as *removing* an offence); 'to buy' (as *taking away* goods); (ii) 'to turn'; 'to overthrow' (as *overturning* a person or thing); 'to pour' (as *turning over* a vessel or its contents). The Heb. אבךְ corresponds with (i) *abāku* or *apāku* and the Heb. הפך with (ii) *abāku*. The ultimate identity of these various forms in a single root is in a high degree probable. Other verbs derived from the same root are Jud.-Aram. אפך 'turned back' and Arab. أفك 'deterred'. There are, then, three stages in the development of this root: I. Bab.-Ass. *abāku* = Heb. אבך 'turn', especially 'turn away' in the sense of 'carry away'; II. Bab.-Ass. *abāku* or *apāku* = Heb. הפך 'turn', especially 'turn round' or 'turn over' in the sense of 'overthrow'; III. Jud.-Aram. אפך 'turn' in the sense of 'turn back' and Arab. أفك 'turn' in the sense of 'deter'. In this connexion Prof. Langdon has reminded me that the permansive of the II i theme (Pi.) is used intransitively in the sense of melting away or the like in the phrase *abnu ubbuk* 'the mineral is carried away', namely, melted away[2]; this usage comes extraordinarily close to that of the Hithpa. of אבך in the passage of Isaiah here discussed.

Since Prof. A. A. Bevan has expressed grave doubts whether the Arab. أُلِخ VIII 'was confused', 'turned sour',[3] actually exists,[4] the root of the Heb. אלח, which is found only in the Niph. נאלח, has become a mystery. The sense 'filthy' (Pss. xiv 3 and liii 4) or 'corrupt' (Job xv 16), given in the R.V., is derived from the ancient Versions. This meaning, however, can be established from the cognate Bab.-Ass. *alāḫu*. The Sum. *SUG* is equated in a bilingual syllabary with *ulluḫu*, the II i theme (Pi.) of this verb, as well as with *ri'āšu* 'to exult', *ḫanābu* 'to be luxuriant', *rakābu* 'to mount' (*sens. obsc.*) and *raḫû* 'to emit *semen*'[5]; and the same Sum. *SUG* is elsewhere rendered by *malû* 'to be full' and *ṣênu* 'to abound'.[6] Thus it is said that the goddess Ba'u (or Ishtar) *kuzba ulluḫat munamе ṣa'nat* 'abounds in luxury, is full of . . . (?)'.[7] The Bab.-Ass. *alāḫu* therefore clearly denotes luxuriant abundance; consequently it may be suggested that the meaning of the Heb. אלח is something analogous. Thus the Niph. may have meant primarily 'debauched with luxury' and then, in a moral sense, 'corrupt'. Here the Versions have either preserved a true tradition or have correctly conjectured the sense from the context.

---

[1] Delitzsch *A.Hwb.* p. 6, and Muss-Arnolt *Ass. Dict.* p. 6.

[2] Thompson *Ass. Chem.* p. 152 (= pl. ii), l. 29.

[3] Cited by B.-D.-B. p. 47 and G.-B. p. 41.

[4] In *Some Contributions to Arabic Lexicography* on p. 55 of *Oriental Studies resented to Prof. E. G. Browne.*

[5] In *Rev. d'Ass.* vol. ix pp. 77–79.

[6] Langdon *Sum. Gr.* p. 243.

[7] Ebeling *K.A.R.I.* no. 109, Obv. l. 15.

All editors have obelized the verb חלה in 1 Sam. xxii 8, where אֵין־חֹלֶה מִכֶּם עָלַי 'there is none of you that is sorry for me' (R.V.) is usually altered to אֵין־חֹמֵל מִכֶּם עָלַי 'there is none of you that has compassion on me',[1] on the analogy of 1 Sam. xxiii 21, where Saul says: בְּרֻכִים אַתֶּם לַיהוָה כִּי חֲמַלְתֶּם עָלָי. The LXX indeed have πονεῖν in both passages, on which is based the inference that the M. T. originally had the same verb in each place. But the inference is false; for, whereas they have πονεῖν for חמל only in xxiii 21, they use it for חלה in six other passages of the Old Testament.[2] The correct inference, if any could be drawn, would be that חמל is wrong in xxiii 21, especially since πονεῖν is at the best a very inexact rendering of it. Even, however, if it is not assumed that the LXX definitely support חלה, so much cannot be said of the other versions: thus the Targ.-Jon has כאיב 'vexed' for חלה and חם 'spared' for חמל, and the Pesh. similarly has ܟܪܐ 'vexed' for the former and ܚܣ 'spared' for the latter[3]; the Eth. version has ሐመ: 'was sick' or 'grieved' for חלה and አሠነየ: 'did good' (paraphrastically) for חמל. Both the Syr. and Eth. versions employ these verbs elsewhere for חלה: for example, the Pesh. has ܟܪܐ in Jer. x 19, xiv 17, and Nah. iii 19 (18), and the Eth. version has ሐመ: in 2 Chron. xxxii 24 and Jer. v. 3. It may therefore be assumed that the Syr. and Eth. versions certainly, and the LXX very probably, read חלה in 1 Sam. xxii 8. What then does חלה here mean? All three translators took it as the well-known חלה 'was sick', used metaphorically to mean 'was grieved'; but such a usage is, as the commentators have said, very unlikely. It may therefore be suggested that it is a case of a totally different root cognate with the Eth. ኀለየ: (var. ሐለየ:) 'looked out' (ለ: 'for'), which is used both for μεριμνᾶν (Lk. xii 22) and προνοεῖν (1 Tim. v 8) with indirect objects in the New Testament. The prep. על 'on behalf of' is similarly used after שקד (Jer. xxxi 27) and נלחם (Judges ix 17 and 2 Kings x 3). The true sense of the passage, then, is that Saul complains that all are against him and that 'there is none of you that taketh thought' or 'careth for me'.

---

[1] Klostermann *Die Bücher Samuelis u. der Könige* p. 98.

[2] Hatch and Redpath *Concordance* vol. ii p. 1186.

[3] Cp. Gen. xix 16.

What is the reason for removing the fem. לִבָּה from the Hebrew vocabulary, except that it is *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον* in Ezek. xvi 30? The LXX read the same consonants, although they vocalized it לְבִתֵּךְ 'to thy daughter' instead of לִבָּתֵךְ 'thy spirit'; the Pesh.'s ܠܒܪܬܟܝ reflects the same error.[1] It may further be asked whether such simple words as מה לי [ו]לבריתך[2] would ever have been corrupted into the uneasy מה אמלה לבתך, as Cornill suggests.[3] Since, therefore, the earliest versions point to the correctness of the Massoretic text, every effort must be made to explain it. This indeed is not difficult; for the Hebrew לִבָּה 'spirit' beside לֵב 'heart' cannot be regarded as an impossible word, since at least two other Semitic languages have both masc. and fem. nouns derived from the same root. The Bab.-Ass. *libbu* 'heart' and *libbatu*, though occurring only in the plur. *libbâtu* 'anger', co-exist side by side[4]; so also do the Aram. לב 'heart' and לבתא 'anger'. The latter, it appears, is a *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον* like the Hebrew word; for it has so far been found only in an Aramaic document from Asshur, in which it is used twice. There occur there the sentences הלבתי מלא את לבת אלהא 'art thou full of anger against me, of anger against God?' and למה לבתי מלא 'why (art thou) full of anger against me?'[5] The Assyrian source of this document makes it possible to suppose that לבתא is here an Assyrian loan-word; but that hardly vitiates the argument. For the Bab.-Ass. word alone suffices to shew that a feminine noun from the √לבב is not inconceivable in a Semitic language. Further, it stands side by side with an obvious Hebraism, the interrogative -ה, found otherwise only in Bibl. Aram. and the Targûmîm, namely in western Aramaic. Cornill's argument that לבה = לב is not to be assumed, since it cannot be proved and that there would have been ample opportunity for its use, if it had existed, is hardly convincing. It may have been a rare synonym of לב, a neologism of Ezekiel's time which enjoyed only a brief life, or a loan-word from some neighbouring language. It is suggested, therefore, that the Heb. לִבָּה 'spirit' be left in the text of Ezekiel.

---

[1] Cp. Field *Origenis Hexapla* vol. ii p. 806, where it is stated that ܠܠܒܟܝ is actually the reading of the Syr.-Hex. version.

[2] Herrmann (*Ezechiel* p. 94) confesses that *eine befriedigende Konjektur gibt es nicht, auch mit Hilfe der Versionen.*

[3] In *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* pp. 264–265.

[4] The precise meaning of this word in the phrase *ina ḫup libbāti imuat* 'he will die through breaking of spirit = of a broken spirit (?)' or 'of an outburst of rage (?)' (Harper *A. B. L.* no. 657, ll. 20–21) is uncertain; but the first appears preferable to the second rendering.

[5] Lidzbarski *Altaram. Urk. aus Ass.* p. 8, ll. 19 and 20 (cp. p. 13 n.).

Another noun of uncertain meaning occurs in the phrase לַהֲקַת הַנְּבִיאִים 'the company of the prophets' (R.V.) in 1 Sam. xix 20. The word is otherwise unknown, and it is clear that the rendering 'company' is based on the LXX's ἐκκλησία; this, like the Targ.'s סִיעָה, the Pesh.'s ܟܢܫܐ and the Eth. version's ማኅበር፡ 'company', is probably a conjecture from the context. That the word does not occur elsewhere, however, is hardly a valid reason for replacing it by the rare (and otherwise post-exilic) קְהִלָּה 'assembly'; for this word seems to denote too large an assembly for the present passage.[1] Nor is there any reason to account for the corruption of a noun derived from a particularly common root into an absolutely unknown word; in fact, the principle that *difficilior lectio potior* approves the reading להקה. Is it not possible to refer it to the root להק 'old'[2] of frequent occurrence in Ethiopic? Thus ልሂቅ፡ 'old' is used not only literally of age but also as a term of respect or dignity, for the Hebr. זָקֵן in the O.T. and the Gk. πρεσβύτερος in the N.T.; there it is employed also for the Gk. διδάσκαλος and νομοδιδάσκαλος. The collective noun derived from it, መልሀቅት፡, which Dillmann renders by *Ältestenschaft*, denotes the Heb. זִקְנֵי הָעָם and the Gk. πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ.[3] If then this connexion is allowed, the Heb. להקה will mean primarily 'an elder-company' and then a 'venerable band' having passed through the same developement as the Gk. πρεσβυτέριον 'elders' and then 'presbytery'. As a literal translation of לַהֲקַת הַנְּבִיאִים something like 'the seigniory of the prophets' may be proposed, although the R.V.'s 'company' may be generally accepted.

It is usually assumed, quite rightly, that נמרץ as used of a curse or destruction is the Niph. of מרץ 'was sick' and that it means 'made sick', namely 'sore' or 'grievous': cp. קְלָלָה נִמְרֶצֶת 'grievous curse' (1 Kings ii 8) and חֶבֶל נִמְרָץ 'grievous destruction' (Mic. ii 10). The analogous מַכָּה נַחְלָה 'grievous wound' (Jer. xiv 17) supports this interpretation. But the phrase מַה־נִּמְרְצוּ אִמְרֵי־יֹשֶׁר 'how forcible are the words of uprightness' (R.V.) in Job vi 25 is generally held to be difficult, and the variant reading נִמְלְצוּ 'are sweet', though attested only by one MS and the Targ., has been adopted. The R.V.'s rendering 'forcible' is ruled out as giving to the √ מרץ an otherwise unknown sense. Gesenius has *acria*, namely *valida victricia verba*[4] which, Gray says,[5] rests on 'the assumption of Cocceius and Simonis that מרץ (properly *acer fuit*, and then *vehemens fuit*) is a metathesis of مضر "to be sour, acid"'. He therefore gives it up. Is he, however, right to do so? It may be suggested, on the contrary, that Gesenius's *acria* is right. For the √ מרץ has now been found applied to words in a Cappadocian text, which may be dated well before 2000 B.C. The passage is to the following effect: ***niāti sībūdum awātam mariztam lā igabiuniāti*** 'unto us, let not the elders speak a harsh word unto us' (literally translated).[1] This shews that the √ מרץ could be applied in a metaphorical sense to words in the Semitic languages. If the passage under discussion is treated as a question and not as an exclamation, the meaning becomes clear. Job, having claimed to be told plainly what sins his friend impute to him, says:

---

[1] Cp. Deut. xxxiii 4 and Neh. v 5.

[2] Cp. Arab. لَهَقَ 'was white', *e.g.* hair (Freytag *Lex. Arab.-Lat.* vol. iv p. 131a).

[3] Dillmann *Lex. Aeth.* cols. 26–28.

[4] In the *Thes. Ling. Hebr. et Chald.* p. 820.

[5] Driver and Gray *Book of Job* pt. ii p. 43.

'How are honest words bitter?
Yet what do you reprove in me?'

He means that, as he knows himself innocent, he has no reason to find words spoken by them in all honesty bitter or grievous; yet it is futile to blame what he has said, since his own words are as the wind and so not to be taken seriously.[2] Surely this interpretation is better than emendation, especially as both yield what is virtually the same sense; for the question 'how are honest words bitter?' is practically equivalent to the exclamation 'how sweet are honest words!' This fact, therefore, accounts for the obvious variant נִמְלְצוּ 'are sweet', which is merely an echo of Ps. xix 103.

In 1 Sam. xxiii 7 the verb נכר (Pi.) is employed in an unusual sense. Consequently most editors alter it in נִכַּר אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים בְּיָדִי 'God hath delivered' (or 'alienated) him into mine hand' (R.V.) into מָכַר 'sold',[3] because the LXX have *πέπρακεν*, and the Eth. version ሤጠ: 'sold'; the Pesh. has simply ܐܫܠܡ 'delivered'. Again, however, the versions are guessing the sense from the context, as the colourless word in the Pesh. shews. Again, too, the principle that *difficilior lectio potior* favours the reading of the Massoretic text. Can, therefore, נכר be defended, although B.-D.-B. stigmatize it as 'improbable'? I suggest that an affirmative answer can again be given; for there is an almost exactly parallel use of the Bab. *nukkuru* (II i theme, or Pi., of *nakāru* 'to be hostile'). The writer of an early Babylonian letter says that *Nabi-(ii) Ilabrat šangū Anunitum ana* ⅓ *manēm* 8½ *šiqlē kaspim bītam ana Idin-(il)Ilabrat dayānim unakkir* 'N. the priest of A. has alienated' or 'transferred the house to I. the judge for ⅓ maneh 8½ shekels of silver'.[1] This seems to be the sole known example of this usage in Babylonian literature; is it then justifiable to remove a similarly unique example of an analogous idiom from the Hebrew text? It rather suggests that the Pi. of נכר, like the II i theme of *nakāru*, can denote 'to alienate' in the sense of handing over or transferring property, especially by sale, from one person to another.

---

[1] Contenau *Tablettes Cappadociennes* (*Louvre IV*) pl. I, no. 1, ll. 20–22. It is to be noticed that the Cappadocian dialect substitutes *z* for *ṣ* (cp. Driver in *J. R. A. S.*, 1926, p. 730).

[2] Ball (*Book of Job* p. 163) explains the passage similarly, supporting his interpretation by a quotation from an inscription of Darius in which the Bab. *marāṣu* 'to be sick' and then 'to be bitter' is used of a 'troublesome' command. The Cappadocian document, quoted above, makes this usage even more clear. This explanation has the additional advantage that it assigns to מרץ the same meaning here as it bears in Job xvi 3.

[3] Cp. Judges iv 9. Here the LXX have *ἀποδίδωμι*, the Pesh. ܐܫܠܡ, and the Eth. version አግብኦ: ; these variations shew that the versions do not really confirm either the Massoretic text or any conjectural emendation.

These suggestions are put forward, in some cases with considerable diffidence, in others with some degree of confidence, in the hope of clearing up a few of the difficulties caused by the confusion of homonymous roots or by the large number of rare words or meanings which must naturally be found in a dead language.

G. R. DRIVER.

THE PUNCTUATION OF NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS.

I TAKE this opportunity to refer to a matter which I feel to be of considerable importance. An admirable enterprise is on foot, of editing a reliable record of all New Testament readings up to date. I would plead that this ought to include a reliable record of the punctuation also, at the least of the more important manuscripts which are punctuated. The precise value of the punctuation is still rather uncertain, but in some cases it may well be very early. As an example of the importance of shewing reliable evidence, I may take the case of Rom. ix 5, evidently a most important passage in regard of the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. In the almost classical edition of the epistle by Sanday and Headlam in the *International Critical Commentary* it is said (p. 234): 'The strongest evidence against the reference to Christ (i. e. of the last words of the verse) is that of the leading uncial MSS'. Now I believe that I have made it sufficiently plain in *The Expository Times* (April and October 1923) that this supposed argument from the punctuation of the chief uncials is founded on a misconception; certainly the Vatican Codex (B) supports no argument whatever, one way or the other. Hardly any description of the punctuation of the manuscripts, however, is offered in the commentary, and even that little was apparently supplied expressly for the work by Sir F. G. Kenyon, Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum. In particular, there seems to be need (so far as I know) of a reliable record of the punctuation of the *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus* (C) at Paris, which, to judge from an examination kindly made for me by a friend, is very unusual.

---

[1] Ungnad *Babylonian Letters* (*P. B. S.*, VII), pl. lxxxvi = Ungnad *Altbabylonische Briefe* pp. 83–84, no. 117, ll. 17–20.

CUTHBERT LATTEY.

THE point raised by Fr Lattey is important, but it is one that raises great difficulties for an Editor of a critical apparatus. In a certain sense the punctuation of an ancient Greek work is no part of the original tradition; a properly written Greek paragraph goes in theory from the beginning to the end without punctuation, the beginnings and the due subordination of the several sentences being sufficiently indicated by the appropriate particles. The paragraph, on the other hand, is part of the text and should be indicated in an apparatus, if a full record is desired of any MS authority. Normally it is marked in MSS by the end of the last line of the paragraph being left blank, with or without a small horizontal stroke (the *paragraphus*) between that and the next line. But sometimes a break is made by only leaving a small blank space, perhaps of only one letter. This really is a sort of warning to the reader to pause. Somewhat similar is the syllable-divider, often inserted after 'barbarous' Proper Names, as in such sentences as ΑΒΡΑΑΜ·ΕΓΕΝΝΗϹΕΝ, where it stands to warn the reader against pronouncing it *a-braa-me-gen-*, etc. A further advance towards punctuation is found in the habit of some scribes, e. g. of *e*, to set a point at the end of a paragraph (where really it is not needed), and also after numerals and contractions. Then besides all this there is in most MSS, beginning with *k* in the 4th century, a certain amount of real punctuation, i. e. points set in the text to indicate some sort of pause.

But how irregular and inconsistent it almost always is! In going through *k* I got the impression that some of the dots were probably made by the scribe while turning his eye to the exemplar for the next word, e. g. *gaudentes·salutabant* Mk. ix 15, or *exclamauit·pater* Mk. ix 24. At other places, no doubt, the dot is intentional and significant. What is an editor of a 'New Tischendorf' to do? He is not editing *k*, and has to think of balance and clarity as well as of completeness.

Fr Lattey refers to Rom. ix 5 and its disputed punctuation. In such a passage he is obviously right in saying that the facts of the transmitted punctuation should be recorded. But the value, or lack of value, in the punctuation of that verse in any MS depends very greatly on the critical weight of the punctuation in that MS. This value can only be determined by a study of its punctuation elsewhere, in uncontroversial contexts, and the example of *k* warns us that a MS may have a supremely valuable text with a capricious punctuation. Fr Lattey quotes the discussion in the Commentary of Sanday and Headlam (p. 233–238): some readers of the JOURNAL may remember that I brought out a new interpretation of Rom. ix 5 in vol. v, pp. 451–455, to which I still adhere. The essence of this interpretation is that *εὐλογητὸσ εἰστοὺσ αἰῶνασ* implies that the Holy Name (the Tetragrammaton) has been explicitly or implicitly *pronounced*. Well, it is interesting to read Sir F. G. Kenyon's statement (*S. & H.*, p. 234) that A in Rom. ix 5 puts a point after *σάρκα* and also leaves a slight space: the punctuation is here by the original hand and so has some weight, though I am inclined to lay more stress on the 'slight space'. But what is still more important is that in Rom. i 25 before *ὅσ ἐστιν εὐλογητὸσ εἰσ τοὺσ αἰῶνασ* there is also a point and a slight space. This double occurrence of the slight space may be held to indicate that the scribe of A recognized that in both cases we are dealing with similar formulae.

I regret the length of this digression—all about a single point! But I add it to shew how difficult it is to discuss these points properly without verbiage. I am sure all those at all responsible for the projected 'New Tischendorf' are grateful to Fr Lattey for drawing attention to the importance of recording the punctuation of ancient MSS, and if after consideration it is decided not to record it, it will be with the time-honoured phrase that 'the editor regrets that considerations of space make it impossible to comply with Fr Lattey's interesting suggestion'.

F. C. BURKITT.

PSALM lxxxix 9.

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת מִי־כָמוֹךָ חֲסִין יָהּ וֶאֱמוּנָתְךָ סְבִיבוֹתֶיךָ

THE verse seems to translate awkwardly. Would it not be an improvement to divide after כמוך (as Kittel does) and change חסין יה to חסדך or חסדיך? It occurs to me that possibly this was the original reading, for the change would get rid of the unusual חסין (described in BDB as an Aramaism); and would be in keeping with the language of the rest of the Psalm, in which חסד and אמונה occur in several places.

T. H. HUNT.

If this *v.* needs emendation, Mr. Hunt's is a good one. חסין for חסרך is an easy error of transcription: cf. Hab. i 5, 'Behold ye among the nations', where LXX reads בגדים, *καταφρονηταί*, for בגוים (M. T.). But is it well to 'get rid of' Aramaisms? Aramaic was the *lingua franca* for centuries of Western Asia. We ought rather to expect some Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew of almost any age. Moreover when the Hebrew thought of his God and looked down on the gods or the aspirations of his neighbours, he might easily drop into the use of an Aramaic word or phrase. So in Ps. ii 12 he uses the Aramaic phrase נשקו בר 'Kiss the Son'.[1] Very significant also is the Aramaic *v.* in Jer. x 11, 'Thus shall ye say unto them' (the Gentiles who would tempt you to forsake JEHOVAH), 'The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, these shall perish from the earth, and from under the heavens'. To omit this *v.* as editors do is to disregard Hebrew psychology. The root חסן, whether Aramaic or Hebrew appears nearly a dozen times in the Old Testament.

W. EMERY BARNES.

A STAGE IN THE HISTORY OF THE LAUDIAN MS OF ACTS.

MR E. A. LOWE contributes to the January number of *Speculum* a welcome note on the later history of the famous Laudian manuscript of the Acts (Bodl. Libr., MS Laud. Gr. 35). That this book was used by the Venerable Bede for his commentary is generally acknowledged; but what happened to the manuscript after it left Bede's hands and before it was acquired by Archbishop Laud is not clearly ascertained. About twelve years ago I noticed three lines written with a dry point on fol. 226 *b*. These lines are read by Mr Lowe as

MARIAE UIR[GINIS]
GAMUNDUM.

I tried without success to explain this last word, and abandoned the enquiry. But I mentioned to Dr Craster the fact that these scratches could be discerned, and he wrote a short paper on the history of the manuscript in the *Bodleian Quarterly Record* ii 288–290 (1919). He was of opinion that the word in the last line 'is apparently a variant of Gimmund or Gaemmunt, a name of common occurrence in Germany in the eighth and ninth centuries, and found at Lauresheim, Fulda, and St Gall. Inasmuch as the connexion of the manuscript with Bede and even with the Anglo-Saxon world rests wholly on internal evidence it is important to find a Teutonic name inscribed on its pages'.

---

[1] On this passage see *J. T. S.* xviii 24–29.

Mr Lowe, on the other hand, takes the word to indicate the name, not of a person, but of a place: 'Gamundum, Gamundium, Gamundiae, can be no other than Hornbach, situated in the diocese of Metz.' It may now be added that the *Monasterium Hornbah* is glossed *sive Gamundias* in the ninth-century confraternity book of St Gall.[1] This identification is beyond dispute. If any question arise about the termination of the word, it may be added that both forms Gamundium and Gamundum are found in the two earliest manuscripts of the Life of St Pirminius,[2] which was composed in the beginning of the ninth century,[3] and in which it is said that Pirminius died there[4] (about 753). Walahfrid Strabo, in verses written about 826, speaks of the saint as buried at Hornbach,[5] a place which lies in what is now the Palatinate, about four miles south of Zweibrücken (Deux-Ponts).

The fact thus established that the Laudian manuscript was at some time in the eighth century preserved at Hornbach is of remarkable interest. St Pirminius is known as the founder of the famous monastery of Reichenau on the Lower Lake of Constance. He used to be taken for a Frank, but Hrabanus Maurus says expressly that he left his native land and settled in the Frankish territory.[6] He was not an Irishman, and Hauck thought that he was perhaps an Anglo-Saxon.[7] In 724 he founded the monastery at Reichenau, but after three years was obliged to depart. He made his way into Alsatia, and there took part in erecting a monastery at Murbach in the Vosges. Before many years Murbach became the home of the compilers of the earliest Annals drawn up on a definitely Anglo-Saxon model, reckoned by the years of the Incarnation, and in part written in an Insular hand. These Annals enjoyed a very wide diffusion. They passed in course of time down the Rhine to Cologne, across France into Normandy, and from Rouen into England, where they formed the basis of many sets of Annals; but these belong to a later stage. All that concerns us here is that the Laudian manuscript was at Hornbach at a time when that monastery was closely affected by Anglo-Saxon influences.

REGINALD L. POOLE.

---

[1] P. Piper *Libri Confraternitatum* (Berlin, 1884) p. 42.

[2] Ch. vi, ed. O. Holder-Egger, 1887, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores* xv p. 27.

[3] The editor, Holder-Egger, explains the word 'Gemünd, ahd. "Gamundi, gemundi," est confluentia'.

[4] p. 30.

[5] *Poetae Aevi Carolini* ii 304, ed. E. Dümmler, Berlin, 1884.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 224.

[7] *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* i (3rd ed., 1904), 347.

HITTITE AND MITANNIAN ELEMENTS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

In an interesting article recently published in the *Journal Asiatique* (ccix 1) M. Autran has pointed out the existence in both Hebrew and Greek, not only of substantives, but also of verbs, which have the same origin and are alike borrowed from Asia Minor. Not only words like that denoting ‘wine’ (*yayin*, *οἶνος*, Hittite *uinis*) but verbs like אגר, *ἀγείρω*; טלי, *θάλλω*; כרת, *κείρω*; שכן, *σκηνή*, admit of no scientific etymology in either Semitic or Indo-European and must be regarded as loan-words from Asianic languages. What happened in Neo-Hebrew, where Greek verbs were adopted and Hebraized, had already happened in earlier centuries.

I have already noted in the *J. T. S.* xxii 87, p. 267, some examples of borrowing on the part of Hebrew from the Hittite language. *Kohen* is the Moscho-Hittite *kuanis*, Lydian *καυειν*, Karian *κων*, *κοαν*. Araunah the Jebusite is the Hittite *araunis*, ‘the freeman’ or ‘noble’, and in the name of Bath-Sheba (further transformed into Bath-Sheva‘ in 1 Chr. iii 5) we must see the name of the Mitannian and Hittite goddess Kheba. Sheba‘, ‘oath’, and still less Sheva‘ has little sense in such a compound, any more than *bosheth* in a name like Mephi-bosheth, and both owe their origin to a desire to transform the name of a heathen deity into a Hebrew word of similar sound.

But I can go further than I could in 1921, and therewith throw some interesting light on the history of Jerusalem and its inhabitants in the Davidic era. The king of Uru-Salim or Jerusalem, whose letters form part of the Tel el-Amarna correspondence, was Puti- (or Buti-) Kheba, ‘the Servant of Kheba’. The name, however, was not confined to men; there were no genders in Mitannian and, as Gustavs has shewn, Puti-Kheba was also a female name, like Tadu-Kheba, ‘Favourite of Kheba’, which was a male name as well as that of a daughter of the Mitannian King Dusratta. Kheba, Khebê, ‘the queen of heaven’, was a Mitannian goddess and was especially worshipped at Aleppo, where the Mitannian language was spoken, but she had been borrowed by the Hittites and become among them the patron deity of Kizzuwadna (the district of Kumana, N.E. of Aleppo) as well as of Khubisna (Kybistra), Tuwanuwa (Tyana), and Uda (Hydê).

In Puti-Kheba or Buti-Kheba I see the Hebraized Bath-Sheba, whose husband was Uriyah the Hittite, where the analogy of the Hebraized Aranyah, for Araunah (2 Sam. xxiv 18), would point to an original Uranah or Urianah. Urana is clearly the Hittite military title *auriyas*, also written *uriyas*, *uras*, and *uranis*, 'a captain of the body-guard' (*KUB* xiii p. 2. 13), whence *uriyakhta* 'he was captain' (*KUB* xix p. 3. 7). Connected words are *auwariyas* and *auriyalus* 'body-guard', 'police' (*KUB* xiii p. 7. 22; v p. 52. 16).[1] According to 2 Sam. xi 3 the mother of Bath-Sheba was Eli'am, but 1 Chron. iii 5 corrects this into 'Ammiel, in which we may see a Hebraized form of the Hittite *ammiel*, 'mine own'; or, less probably, of the name Ammali(s) 'belonging to the Mother-goddess'. The suffix *-l* was common in Hittite as in other Asianic languages.

Araunah and Uriyah are stated to be Hittites (if we accept the common view that the Jebusites were of Hittite origin). On the other hand Puti-Kheba was a Mitannian name and the enemies of Puti-Kheba in the Tel el-Amarna tablets were the Khabiri. The Khabiri, or Khabiriyas as the Hittites called them, constituted part of the body-guard of the Hittite kings and at Boghaz Keui, we are told, there were 1,200 of them, the other half of the royal body-guard consisting of the Lulakhi, the Leleges, probably, of Greek tradition. The Khabiri had been introduced into Asia Minor from Babylonia along with other elements of Babylonian civilization; we first hear of them as forming the body-guard of the Elamite prince Rim-Sin whose capital was Larsa and who exercized sovereignty over both Babylonia and the later Assyria (2050 B.C.) In Elam the name survived under the form of Khabirâ.

The Khabiri play a prominent part in the letters of Puti-Kheba and in southern Palestine were to the loyal supporters of the Egyptian empire what the Amorites and the native Hittite troops were in the north. As we hear of them elsewhere in the Tel el-Amarna age only in connexion with the Hittites we may regard them as a sort of irregular Hittite advanced guard. This view is supported by the name of *sagasi* or 'executioners' frequently given to them. The body-guards of the Asianic princes in later days preserved the title, the name Astralias given to them signifying 'executioners' who carried out 'the murderous' orders of their paymasters (Hesychius *s. v.* Τράλλεις[2]). The Τράλεις, or mercenary horse and foot, are mentioned in an inscription of Eumenes I (*Jahrb. d. kgl. Preuss. Kunstsaml.* ix p. 82).

I think, therefore, it is safe to conclude that Hittites as well as Mitannians were settled in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood in the Tel el-Amarna age. Now Ezekiel tells us (xvi 3) that 'the shaping and nativity' of Jerusalem was 'of the land of the Canaanite', but that its 'father was the Amorite and (its) mother a Hittite'. In other words, while the fortress-city of Uru-Salim or Jerusalem was in the land of Canaan—Kinakhkhi in the Tel el-Amarna and Hittite texts—its inhabitants were primarily Amorites and secondarily Hittites, since the father preceded the mother.

---

[1] The proper name Urani is already found in the Cappadocian tablets (2300 B. C.).

[2] See also *s. v.* Ἀστραλίαν· τὸν Θράκα· Λυδοί.

In *Ancient Egypt* (Sept. 1924) I have pointed out that Amurrû, the Babylonian original of אמרי, Amorite, is a Semitized form of the Sumerian Murrû (the short initial vowel being due to the pronunciation Mwŭrrû), the name by which the population west and north-west of Babylonia was known to the Babylonians. An important Sumerian text published by Professor Langdon states that the pre-Sumerian population of Babylonia itself was Murrian[1], and this is confirmed by archaeological discovery in both Babylonia and Assyria. In Assyria the earliest recorded rulers of Assur bear Mitannian (or, as I should prefer to write, Subaraean) names, and the Mitannian king Dusratta, in his letter to the Pharaoh, gives Murrû-khe and Murwu-khe, 'the land of Murrû', as the native equivalent of the Assyrian Mitanni.

Similarly in the Hittite texts Murri and Mur-las correspond to 'Mitanni' and 'Mitannian'. (Cp. the Biblical Moriah and Môreh, Gen. xii 6.) In accordance with this, most of the names of the Amorite princes found in the cuneiform inscriptions are Mitannian, and on the Egyptian monuments the Amorites are depicted as a blond race with blue eyes and fair hair, in contradistinction to the 'black-headed' Sumerians and dark-haired Semites. That is to say they came originally from Asia Minor or the Caucasus.[2]

Puti-Kheba of Jerusalem, with his Mitannian name, was thus a representative of the Biblical Amorite. The Hittite had not yet occupied Jerusalem, and as there is no mention of the Jebusite in the Tel el-Amarna texts we may conclude that in the Jebusites we must see the Hittites who subsequently established themselves there. Puti-Kheba's letters indicate that the Khabiri were already threatening the city and in the Khabiri, as we now know, we have to see the Hittite mercenaries. Ezekiel's statement is thus proved to be in exact agreement with the most recent archaeological discovery.

---

[1] Lugal-banda, the Sumerian king of Dêr, east of the Tigris, came to the help of the (Sumerian) king of Erech with the result that 'Sumer and Akkad expelled entirely the abominable Amorite' (*Kengi Uri nigin-ba Murrû senusu khu-mu-si*; Langdon 'Weld-Blundell Collection in the Ashmolean Museum' i p. 5, *Legend of Lugal-banda* ii 12–13).

[2] In one of the Hittite historical texts (Bo. 2361. 9–12) Murri (MAT URU *Mur-ri*) and Amurra (MAT URU *A-mur-ra*) are explicitly identified: 'When my grandfather Subbiluliuwas marched into the country of Murri, he smote the whole of the Murri-men, and established his frontier on the farther side of Kinza (Kadesh on the Orontes) and Amurra.' The Hittite proper name Mur-si-lis corresponds in formation to names like Khattu-si-lis, Qui-si-lis, etc., and signifies 'the Murrian'. I believe we have a reminiscence of it in the name of the city Marlos, Greek Mallos, since the city of Muru or Murri mentioned in the Assyrian texts was on the coast of south-eastern Cilicia.

The combination of Mitannian and Hittite created the Jerusalemite. The latter name occurs in the Egyptian papyrus which describes the conspiracy against Ramses III (1195 B.C.). Here 'the Jerusalemite' (Pa-Yari-salama) is named among the conspirators by the side of (the Hittite) Garpus, Yûnini the Libyan, Pa-Khar ('the Palestinian'), Pa-Lamnanî ('the Lebanonian'), Pa-Alasiaî ('the Cyprian'), Pa-Luka ('the Lycian'), and 'the Negro' (Phinehas). We must therefore expect to find Mitannian as well as Hittite names and words in the Old Testament. It was not only at Jerusalem that Hittite and Mitannian were mixed together. The Tel el-Amarna letters have shewn that Hittite settlers and officials were spread throughout Palestine from one end of the country to the other. In the words of the book of Genesis, Heth was the second son of Canaan.

Hittite infiltration in Canaan goes back to an early period. Damascus and the Beka' (Dammaskhu-nas and Bikuwiyas) had been conquered by Telibinus I about 1700 B.C., nearly two centuries after the capture of Babylon and the overthrow of the Babylonian empire[1] of Ammurapi by Mursilis I in 1875 B.C., and an official of Amenemhat I, the Egyptian Pharaoh of the Twelfth Dynasty, already refers to a Hittite settlement in the extreme south of Palestine. In the early astrological texts of Babylonia the Hittites take their place by the side of the Amorites. The Subaraean or Mitannian languages, on the other hand, extended from Arbakha or Arpakha, the modern Kerkuk, on the eastern side of the Tigris to Aleppo and the Hittite frontier in the north-west. Just as in later days the Assyrian kings call Syria and Palestine 'the land of the Hittites', so the earlier scribes of Babylonia include them in 'the land of the Amurrû'. 'The Amorite was then in the land', as well as the Hittite.

The burial-place of Machpelah, we are told, was bought by Abraham rom Ephron the Hittite, the son of Zohar who 'dwelt among the children of Heth' (Gen. xxiii 10). Zohar (צחר) is the Zukharu of the Assyro-Cappadocian tablets and signified the 'boy' or agent of the Babylonian and Assyrian 'merchants' (*śakhiri*) settled at Kanes on the Halys. The shekels (Ass. *siqli*) paid by Abraham were those which, as in Cappadocia, passed 'current with the merchant' (*'obêr liś-śokhêr*), and it is noticeable that the Biblical writer (in *vv.* 16, 17) repeats the technical language of the contract tablets found at Kanes (Kara Eyuk) and Kerkuk. The position of Zohar at Mamre, it will be observed, was precisely that of the Zukharu among the native population of Kanes.

---

[1] *BKT* ii 1. 44.

In 'Ephron the Hittite' we ought to have a Hittite name. In names like Tudkhaliyas (Tid'al) or Markhasi (Mer'ash) Hittite *kh* corresponds to the Semitic ע̇ (*ghain*), and if the first letter of 'Ephron is *ghain* rather than *'ain* we must assume that its equivalent in Hittite is the same. *Khipparas* in the Hittite Code of Laws signifies 'freeholder', while *khappar* is a 'freehold' (*K U B* xiii p. 15. 65, 66) and the verb *khappara-uwar* means 'to lay claim to', and hence 'acquire (a freehold)'.[1] Ephron, 'the Freeholder', was thus absolute master of the property which he sold to Abraham, who, though a 'foreigner' like the Assyro-Babylonians at Kanes, was nevertheless, like certain of them, also an official of the Babylonian king. He was, we learn, not only a *gêr* (*v.* 4) but also a *nĕsîʾ elohîm*, the Babylonian *nisik ilâni*. *Ilâni*, the common title of the Babylonian monarchs of the Ammurapi dynasty, planted itself so firmly in Canaan that as late as the Tel el-Amarna age it is the usual title applied to the Egyptian Pharaohs who had taken the place of the Babylonian kings.

Between the Hittite *khipparas* and the name of the Khabiri there was no connexion except that every Khabiriyas was also a *khipparas*. But it is quite possible that later generations, in the age when Khabiri were encamped at Hebron, may have fancied that such was the case. In Hittite no difference was made, at all events in writing, between *bi* and *pi*. And it is not impossible that Mamra, the earlier name of Hebron, may have been of Hittite origin. It was certainly not Semitic, but I know of no similar name in Asia Minor. The word *marmaras* with the possible signification of 'herbage' or 'crops' occurs in the Legend of Telibinus (*K U B* xvii p. 11. 12) and Mama was the Mother-goddess of Asia Minor. I still adhere to my old conviction that the name of Hebron was derived from that of the Khabiri, whose name was borrowed from Western Semitic and meant 'auxiliaries' in Assyrian. The Tel el-Amarna tablets indicate that there was a settlement of them (Khabiri-KI) in the neighbourhood of Hebron, and there was another Hebron in the north of Israel (Joshua xix 28). The native population of Hebron-Mamra were the Anakim who called the city Kirjath-Arba' (Joshua xiv 15). The Mitannian equivalent of Kirjath-Arba' would have been 'Arba-khi,[2] the old name of the modern

---

[1] Friedrich (*Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches* p. 92) prefers the signification of 'trader', 'artisan', for *khipparas*, and his view is supported by a passage in an astrological tablet, where the verb in the Assyrian phrase 'the father will sell his son for silver' is rendered by *khapra*[*izzi*]. But the Legal Code seems to leave no doubt that the term was used technically for the native artisan or foreign merchant to whom land was assigned in virtue of his calling. It is expressly stated that the sale of 'his son, his field, and his vineyard' was illegal. Unfortunately the meaning of the ideographic equivalent of *khipparas* is unknown.

[2] Sometimes written Arba'-KHA 'four fish', in rebus fashion in Assyrian.

Kerkuk. The Hebrew ʿAnaq is the Assyrian Unqi, the name given by the Hittites to the plain or valley of Antioch (now the ʿUmq), and is merely the Hittite form of the Semitic *ʿemeq* ‘valley’.[1] The Valley of Hebron is mentioned by Thothmes III in his Palestine Geographical List; the Anakim, in fact, would have been simply ‘the Lowlanders’. As such they are named on the Egyptian potsherds of the Eleventh Dynasty recently published by Sethe (*Aechtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongesfäßscherben*) where three of their princes are referred to, ʿAm (עם), Abi-Mamu (אבי־ממו), and ʿAk(e)m (עכם), all of which names are Semitic, the second being compounded with the name of the Asianic goddess Mama. In Assyrian, however, Mama was a god, Mamatu being the goddess.

A. H. SAYCE.

---

[1] The country is called Amka in the Tel el-Amarna texts. In the Syrian Geographical List of Thothmes III the name is written Amíqu (No. 308).

KUB = *Keilinschiftliche Urkunden aus Boghazköi*, Berlin, 1924–.

REVIEWS

The Religion of the Semites, by the late W. ROBERTSON SMITH. Third Edition, with an Introduction and Additional Notes by STANLEY A. COOK. (A. & C. Black, London, 1927.)

To read *The Religion of the Semites* afresh is like revisiting the haunts of our youth and finding a welcome from old friends and familiar landmarks. We are almost surprised to discover the influence which the book has had upon our mental history. From the very first we felt confidence in a guide, incomparably well equipped, who started from the position that 'the consciousness of communion is the most vital phenomenon in all religion'. He approached his undertaking as a believer, and, while working always in a thoroughly scientific spirit, he made it his aim to trace the links which connect the crude beliefs of the early Semites with the spiritual conceptions of Yahweh taught by the prophets. It was as bearing upon the Old Testament that we found Robertson Smith's method and conclusions so illuminating; and our satisfaction is undiminished when we come again upon such far-reaching summaries as 'Religion was a part of the organized social life into which a man was born', it 'did not exist for the saving of souls, but for the preservation and welfare of society' (pp. 21, 29). He emphasized the joyous character of early religion, and pointed out how inadequate this was to keep pace with the advance of civilization, especially when disasters befell the social system: 'the God who could deal with such evils was the God of the prophets, no mere Oriental king raised to a throne in heaven, but a just and jealous God' (pp. 65 f, 259). 'To free the spiritual truth from the husk was the great task that lay before the ancient religions, if they were to maintain the right to continue to rule the minds of men' (p. 439). Pregnant sayings of this kind occur again and again; they opened our eyes and shewed us the way.

It will be remembered that Robertson Smith made use of two main principles, Totemism and Taboo, for the purpose of his investigation. At the totem-stage of society each clan or group 'believes itself to be physically akin to some natural kind of animate or inanimate thing, most generally to some kind of animal' (p. 124). In the process of time there grows up a belief in local nature-gods that were also clan-gods, and belonged to the same stock as their worshippers; the conception of kinship was fundamental, and governed not only man's relation to the deities, but the kind of homage he offered; his sacrifices consisted of the domestic animals akin to himself, and in sacrificing them his aim was to strengthen the bond between God and man by killing and feeding upon a victim akin to both. Sacrifice thus becomes, according to its fundamental idea, not a tribute, but an act of 'communion between the god and his worshippers by joint participation in the living flesh and blood of a sacred victim' (p. 345).

The other principle, that of Taboo, 'a system of restrictions on man's arbitrary use of natural things, enforced by the dread of supernatural penalties' (p. 152), is found to lie behind laws of holiness when men are dealing with friendly deities, and laws of uncleanness when evil spirits are concerned. So from these primitive restrictions can be derived such customs as the ban and the ordeal, the protection of human rights by divine sanctions, the contagion of holy things and persons, and ultimately the first steps towards a moral order (pp. 446 ff).

When Robertson Smith put forward these theories in 1889 they were new and revolutionary; and of course they were criticized. The argument seemed to attach an exaggerated importance to totemism in the history of religion. Recent discoveries, while they support the view that kinship was a ruling idea in primitive society, connect totemism with magic rather than with religion; and, as Dr Stanley Cook points out, the line of developement is not nearly so direct as Robertson Smith imagined; the real problem for the modern investigator is to discover 'the varying relations between the "religious" and "non-religious" phases of life and their mutual interaction' (pp. xlvi, lxi). Long ago it was remarked that the idea of a primitive communion is too abstract, too theological, to serve as the motive for savage rites of sacrifice; and the present editor himself suggests that Robertson Smith 'carried simplification too far, and formulated too simple a theory of the history of religion' (p. xlii). We are now inclined to believe that more than one type, and more than one motive, is to be found in the institution of sacrifice.

Nevertheless the conspicuous theories of *The Religion of the Semites* have not yet been replaced by better ones, so Dr Stanley Cook ventures to assert (p. xxix); the book remains a classic; and now that he has brought it up-to-date, with a knowledge of the subject such as few possess, the student of Semitic origins is provided with the best of guidance. Two or three instances may be given to illustrate the value of this new edition, and at the same time to shew how later researches call for a correction of Robertson Smith's views. He protested against the opinion, once widely spread, that Semitic religion tended towards monotheism from the first; the tendency is now seen to be stronger than he thought, and the whole problem of monotheism stands in need of restatement (pp. 526 ff). Again, he maintained that Baʿal was essentially a god of the fertile, watered earth; but it is now known that as early as

800 B.C. Ba'al was worshipped as a sky-deity; and though the title 'Ba'al of heaven' occurs late on the monuments, the conception is really ancient (p. 532). Robertson Smith throughout draws a distinction between 'Israelite' and 'Canaanite' which archaeological evidence obliterates; we are now aware that the difference is almost imperceptible. The existence of a goddess 'Ashērah has at last been clearly established (pp. 188, 560 ff). Speaking generally, scholars nowadays are more inclined to appeal to the vast stores of Babylonian literature than to primitive Arab life (p. 535). The field to be surveyed has widened immensely, and the study has become much more complicated, as Dr Stanley Cook is careful to prove by a wealth of references to the original sources. His additions are not confined to mere notes; many of them are dissertations on fundamental questions, such as monotheism, mana, theriomorphism, property. At times, it must be admitted, he is difficult to follow, and we cannot feel sure about his own opinion or the conclusion to which he wishes to lead us. He represents a more detached position than Robertson Smith: his interest lies rather in the facts than in the developement. Of his predecessor he writes with a disciple's enthusiasm and insight, and maintains that, in spite of all later additions to our knowledge, as an introduction to the subject no better starting-point exists than *The Religion of the Semites.*

G. A. COOKE.

The Nature of Existence, by J. M. E. MCTAGGART, Litt.D., F.B.A., Vol. II, edited by C. D. BROAD, Litt.D. (Cambridge University Press, 1927.)

THE first volume of this treatise was published in 1921. Dr McTaggart did not live to see the issue of the second volume, but he left instructions that, in the event of his death before it could be published, Dr Broad should be entrusted with the task of supervising the publication. The late Dr McTaggart was in the habit of making several complete drafts of his books before publishing them, and it is from the third, and partly from the second, of these that the work has been printed. The editor assures us that it is unlikely the author, had he lived, would have made any substantial changes on what is now published.

A word of thanks is due to Dr Broad. He has divided the book into numbered sections, supplied cross-references, and added a very full and useful Analytical Table of Contents. In the absence of an index this will be found indispensable.

Dr McTaggart was one of the few in these days who believed it was possible to demonstrate truths about the universe by metaphysical arguments. Yet his method was not purely *a priori*: at points he accepts certain facts on the evidence of experience. Thus that something exists is empirically assured, and that what exists is also differentiated into parts is also taken as fact. The object then is to determine what are the characteristics of all that exists, and having done so to draw the theoretical and practical consequences. While the earlier volume was in the main *a priori* in its method, the second volume is not rigidly demonstrative throughout, but in the main puts forward conclusions which may be judged highly probable. In this notice I can say little about Dr McTaggart's metaphysics, but shall merely try to indicate the bearing of his thought on certain religious problems.

Dr McTaggart defines substance as that which has qualities without itself being a quality, and, in his sense of the word, even an event is a substance. He thinks he has proved that all things which exist are substances, that all substances have parts and are differentiated, that all parts of substance and all collections of substances are themselves substances, and finally that all substances are spiritual and nothing but substances are selves. Hence we have an idealism, so far agreeing with that of Hegel, which asserts that nothing but spirit exists. This type of idealism has of course many difficulties to face. But what concerns us is the way in which the writer, from his philosophic standpoint, deals with the problems of God, Immortality, and the Good in the world-process.

Dr McTaggart's line of thought has no place for the transcendent or for faith. God cannot, he argues, be creator, for selves are primary parts of the universe and ultimate. Neither can God, regarded as the whole, be a self; for one self cannot include another as he forcibly contends. So God falls out of the scheme, and there is instead a pluralistic universe of selves which are fundamental. Why human selves must be identified with these fundamental differentiations is not quite clear. The writer's discussion of immortality is vitally influenced by his view of time and its validity. In this connexion Dr McTaggart distinguishes three series: an A. series running from the distant past, through the present, into the far future; a B. series described simply as earlier and later; and a C. or timeless series or order, passing from the less to the more complete, from 'included in' to 'inclusive of'. The A. series involves in each term the incompatible predicates of past, present, and future, and is rejected as unreal. Why this criticism does not also condemn the B. series is not apparent. We are told it is not ultimately real, yet it is somehow *bene fundatum*; for the C., or truly real series, is misperceived as the B. series. It is hard to understand this misperception, nor is it easy to see why we should be practically concerned about the future when neither time nor change is real. It seems to me that the concept of change is ultimate, and we cannot deny its reality if our practical life is to have meaning and consistency.

We can see, however, why Dr McTaggart, though rejecting theism, can still hold a doctrine of immortality. Selves, being fundamental differentiations of reality, can neither come into being nor pass away: they are eternal. Regarded, of course inadequately, as falling within the time-series, they must be deemed to have pre-existence and post-existence, and this will mean a number of lives after the present. Obviously, since we do not remember a state prior to this, we shall not carry the memory of the present state into that which follows, and some plausible reasons are given why identity and value do not depend on memory. The objection from a religious point of view is, that with the complete lapse of memory the moral continuity of personality is lost, and there is only a metaphysical principle of identity like the Hindu Karma. On Dr McTaggart's theory death is merely an incident which does not touch the deeper reality of the spirit. As he finely says: 'Death acquires a deeper and more gracious significance when we regard it as part of the continually recurring rhythm of progress, as inevitable, as natural, as benevolent as sleep.' It should be added, however, that, according to the author, when souls come to their ultimate completion, a state which corresponds to the final stage of the C. series, there will be memory of the preceding stages.

At the close of the book the problem is discussed whether the value in the universe is being increased, and if the goal will mean the achievement of a good that infinitely exceeds all the evils on the way to it. Evil, it is frankly recognized, is no mere defect, and it is concluded that the course of the world, regarded *sub specie temporis*, will exhibit oscillations in the amount of good and evil within it. Even the final stage will not be one of perfectly unmixed good, though the good in it will infinitely exceed the evil. Of that good we know that it is a timeless state of love, love 'so direct and intimate' that here we have only 'the slightest foretaste of its perfection'. But Dr McTaggart does not claim to have demonstrated this and various other conclusions. Still he thinks they have a high degree of probability.

One cannot peruse this book without carrying away a vivid impression of the writer's strong independence of mind, his power of strenuous and lucid thinking as well as his gift of clear expression, and his keen critical faculty. He was a late survivor of those who still cling to the idea that it is possible to demonstrate truths about the universe by the *a priori* method. That his method and results will command any general assent is unlikely, for the present trend in philosophy is to cultivate close relations with science, and only to advance tentatively to an ultimate synthesis. Dr McTaggart's procedure is purely intellectual: he has nothing to say about faith, and deals only in demonstrated or probable conclusions. And yet, as with Spinoza, behind the logical severity of thought there lies an emotional life and perhaps a mystical tendency. One may conjecture that emotional values meant a good deal for the writer, and it is perhaps permissible to suppose that this characteristic had some influence in shaping his views on immortality and the final good. At the same time his conclusions, developed as they are with the exclusion of any theistic ground, cannot be deemed convincing. The book, however, will prove an intellectual discipline to those who have the patience and perseverance to follow to the end its closely reasoned arguments.

G. GALLOWAY.

Relativity and Religion, by H. D. ANTHONY, M.A., Ph.D., B.Sc. (London, University of London Press, Ltd., 1927.)

RECOGNIZING that theological thought is dependent on current ideas, and that the influence of science upon theology is mediated through philosophy, Dr Anthony enquires into the implications of the scientific theory of relativity with respect to religious thought. He assumes that this theory has philosophical import; for it is only in so far as it can affect the metaphysics of Nature, or the theory of knowledge, that any variant of Einstein's doctrine can be relevant to natural theology. As this belief is of fundamental importance, the contents of the book being dependent upon it, one could wish that it had received justification in fuller degree. Doubtless several recent philosophers, some of whose views are examined by the author, have entertained it: e.g. Viscount Haldane, Prof. Wildon Carr, and Prof. Eddington. But, as Dr Anthony is aware, this view is rejected by mathematicians such as Prof. Hobson and J. E. Turner; and while Prof. Eddington, who can hardly be thought capable of misunderstanding the theory, only superimposes a metaphysic of his own upon it, there seem to be good reasons for accusing the two philosophers who have been named—and one might add others, such as Prof. Alexander—of misconceiving the nature of Einstein's theory. That theory is really a device for abstractly representing measurable spatio-temporal relations between phenomenal objects and events; for giving expression to the interdependence, formerly unrecognized, of temporal and spatial measurements; and for taking account of the fact that the numerical values assigned to space-distances and time-intervals by reference to some spatial frame and some kind of chronometer, vary according to the relative motions of the observer and his apparatus. The relativity that is contemplated, then, in the theory, is physical relativity—to our standing-ground and instruments: it has nothing to do with relativity to our minds, or with the philosophical question of the relativity of knowledge, as discussed, e.g. by Hamilton. Again, the theory of space-time is but a new geometry, distinguished from others by its peculiar 'metric'. As a geometry, it has nothing to do with metaphysics. The metric introduced into the continuum or the manifold of space-time has been chosen, under the guidance of the calculus of tensors, with a view, chiefly, to economy of *physical* concepts, involving proportionately increased complexity of metric, and has been imposed, by the postulating mind, on the orderless points etc. Realistically-inclined philosophers have gratuitously and erroneously regarded this imposed metric as intrinsic; and that involves hypostatization of descriptive concepts, as much nonentities as Euclid's points, into ontal existents. So the purely conceptual and abstract manifold has come to be spoken of as 'the world', or as Nature as she really is; and to be endowed with such and such 'structure', so that space is talked of as 'crumpled' in a gravitational field. It would seem to be in consequence of these two errors in interpretation that the mathematical and descriptively scientific 'theory' of relativity has come to be credited with implications for theory of knowledge and for metaphysics. And if this be the case, it follows that the theory can have no bearing on theology or on cosmology.

When, in the latter part of this book, the author passes on to make theological applications, it is not so much doctrines connected uniquely with relativity and space-time that are utilized, as the old fact of the interconnectedness or relatedness of things, which the new theory does but further emphasize; the old truth that the science of Nature's structure is but an abstraction from the science of Nature as also a bearer of values; and the old conclusion that Nature 'is significant of mind'. The last-mentioned topic is connected with that of the rationality of the world, which receives some discussion. But 'rationality' is an ambiguous term; and controversy as to whether the world is rational, or as to what extent it is rational, will remain unprofitable so long as we refrain from drawing necessary distinctions between the several senses which the words 'rational' and 'irrational' respectively bear. Neither on this question, nor on the idea of God, nor on the notions of eternity, does it seem to have been shewn that the theory of relativity can have any bearing. Nevertheless the enquiry prosecuted in this volume, whatever be its outcome, is one that theology needed to undertake, and the whole subject is one as to which much curiosity has probably prevailed. Dr Anthony pursues it in the best spirit, and much that is said by the way in his pages will be found interesting.

Réalité et Relativité, by G. Rabeau, Professeur à l'Université de Lublin. (Marcel Rivière, Paris, 1927.)

These *Études sur le relativisme contemporain* are not concerned with what 'relativity' first suggests to the mind at the present hour, nor yet with what the word has generally meant to philosophers in this country. The relativism is something which the author regards as common to writers otherwise so diverse as Cassirer, Wundt, Brunschvigg, Goblot, Simmel, and Croce. It is a 'spiritualism'—an idealism or a subjectivism—which is described as seeing in cognition only its spontaneity and creativeness; as attempting to substitute, for the logic of the known, or of the finished products of knowledge and thought, the logic of knowing and thinking; and as treating the ancient philosophy as a logic of dead ideas. M. Rabeau adduces evidence that Aquinas abundantly recognized the activity of the knower in the knowing process. His book may be commended to students interested in the relation of such attitudes as recent voluntarism or pragmatism to that of scholasticism. It contains little that is of immediate relevance to theology.

F. R. Tennant.

La Religion: deuxième édition: 1924. *L'Église et la France*: 1925. *Religion et Humanité*: 1926. Alfred Loisy. (Paris, Émile Nourry.)

These three books should be read together with *The Selected Letters of Baron von Hügel*. In 1910 von Hügel wrote to Bishop Edward Talbot:

> 'Loisy is having a most interesting, important controversy with (against) Salomon Reinach, and the latter's very able, but shallow, and systematically irreligious *Orpheus*; and many of the things L. is urging against R.'s wholesale depreciation of all religion are, I think, admirable. I only wish that a distinctly sceptical, purely immanentist current were not now painfully evident in some parts of L.'s own work, and that we had not a pretty strong specimen of this current in parts of his article in yesterday's new *Hibbert Journal*. But this current still does not dominate him, throughout many pages of his writing elsewhere, even of the last few weeks, and still allows him, evidently with full sincerity

and no conscious want of logic, to defend religion as deeply true and sacred. May this latter side of him, which can nobly protest that the grace of God, and grace transmitted by the Sacraments, are in very truth no mere empty names, maintain itself, indeed grow stronger and stronger again against that sceptical side, apparent chiefly in his moments of definition and reflective summing up.'

That represents von Hügel's central judgement in what (to the spectator) is the most tragic and arresting force in his career; the gradual 'discrimination' from the friend so heroically loved at first. Was the foreboding, here expressed, fulfilled? Was the intercession effectuated? Those who revere the two men, and care for answers to these questions—alternative answers, or synthetic; ready and absolute, or still delayed—will read the three volumes named above with an eager secondary interest. But that will soon be forgotten. It is not for plain readers to judge M. Loisy's private soul. His sincerity is evident. He is read because the multitude long to know what religion is, what hope for mankind's holier, happier, kinder state exists, what faith is true and practical for such a hope.

The new edition of *La Religion* contains references to the late war, 'une crise d'humanité';

> 'Car', continues M. Loisy in the chapter on *L'évolution religieuse et morale*, 'la révolution religieuse qui couve en Europe depuis plusieurs siècles, coordonnée à une évolution politique, sociale, scientifique, et à l'expansion des peuples chrétiens dans le monde, est arrivée à un moment décisif. La récente guerre, qui se continue en quelque façon dans une paix inquiète et incertaine, n'a pas été qu'une querelle de peuples; nous voyons se perpétuer le duel de l'humanité qui veut être et d'une humanité qui ne veut pas mourir, de la religion qui se fait et de celle qui tombe; la lutte de la liberté des peuples contre le despotisme impérial, de l'idéal du devoir consenti contre l'idéal du devoir imposé, de la justice qui demande à être une force, contre la force qui s'obstine à être un droit. Du dénouement de ce combat tragique dépend l'orientation de l'avenir. Il faut qu'un programme d'humanité meilleure se dégage du bourbier où notre humanité malheureuse a versé tant de sang; que les hommes-vautours, qui se repaissent de carnage, y soient enfin dénoncés pour ce qu'ils sont, les fils de l'animalité; que la notion évangélique de la fraternité humaine soit reprise avec un sens plus juste des conditions qui sont celles de notre existence; que notre espèce trouve d'autres moyens de progrès que le massacre collectif. Sans doute était-il nécessaire qu'elle connût un tel paroxysme de folie, de haine et de cruauté, tout l'épanouissement de sa laideur, pour embrasser avec plus de foi et d'énergie un idéal de sagesse, d'union et de bonté, toute la perfection qu'elle se promet.'

In this passage are concentrated the pity, indignation, sense of reality, 'exact sense of the actual conditions of our existence', which ennoble this book. Here is enthusiastic goodwill such as all religious men must share. And for that enthusiasm there is hope, reasonable hope such as honest thinkers may entertain. For M. Loisy deduces from a survey of history, which may claim to be scientific, a desire and a success towards amelioration evidenced throughout the races and the ages of mankind, as mankind has civilized itself in groups. All this is here, but is religion here?

M. Loisy is sure it is. The very essence of the social civilized life of men is that conscience of perfection 'au-delà', which inspires, impels, enables, which transforms all into spirit: may he not say, which is God in man and man in God?

> 'Tout cela, devoir, dévouement, amour, est sacré dans l'idéal religieux qu'il tend à réaliser. "Dieu est amour", dit l'Écriture.'

But this is 'mere immanentism'. Is it? The ideal which tends to realization but never yet is realized: this mysterious conscience always and only of an 'au-delà': does not this repudiate the facile condemnation? If this is not transcendence, how does it differ from transcendence? Must transcendence only mean an *au-delà* as it were behind? May not the 'as it were' be also construed as in front? If his critics appealed to St John's 'In the beginning', might not M. Loisy counter by appealing to St John's 'Knowing the Father as the one true God and Jesus Christ whom he sent'? For (in spite of modern grammarians) there is force in that present infinitive: John allows not 'knowledge' to man, but only 'coming to know', learning gradually: 'La vérité aussi se fait avec l'humanité' says Loisy. And 'Jesus whom he sent' points to that continuous extending of the Incarnation which is surely the doctrine of *La Religion.*

Yet still an objection. 'Religion is adoration.' Whom does M. Loisy adore? Indeed most of us do miss something in his exposition which we greatly desire. Is it possible that we miss and desire comfortable words, and that there is an adoration which rests in neither words nor rites? Again appeal to Scripture presents itself: 'Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord . . . but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven'. 'In heaven'; *au-delà* in Loisy's cold phrase: not in the limited collective will of the societies or general society of mankind. And that transcendent will, what wills it?

> 'La volonté supérieure du bien est encore extérieure à la conscience, mais elle tend à s'y intérioriser. . . . Rien n'est plus humain que la morale religieuse; rien n'est plus religieux que la morale vraiment humaine.'

M. Loisy is 'modern'. He does innovate, throw down, alter, disturb. He does not put mankind in place of God, but he does contemplate mankind rather than the church. The mankind he contemplates is *au-delà*, a mirage which faith and effort must vivify into a goal. But already it is men generally, not a chosen church, who must be the agents of that effect. For God, Christ, Church, he chants God, Christ, Mankind. And instead of victorious Christianity—'moulé dans l'empire romain en se pénétrant de son esprit'—he dreams of the one religion which shall be 'religion vraiment universelle, une conscience commune de l'humanité . . . la religion héritière de toutes les religions qui l'auront préparée'.

This is indeed to dream. Here is no clearly purposed thought, and when, in the concluding chapter on *Les Symboles de la Foi*, Loisy attempts (rather inconsistently) to fashion a ritual and institutional body to his dream, he drops from a considerable height into almost absurdity.

Dreams, puerilities, a little bitterness, and sometimes not quite good taste: yet considerable height, almost sublimity, poignant sincerity, a theology which may not be labelled and dismissed lightly, but compels the iterated attention of all thoughtful religious men of the world—such is this valuable book: no manual of Christian manners, but a summons to idealists to come into the open and help save a pitiable world.

The best account of it, however, is given by the author himself in his Introduction to *Religion et Humanité*, which is a sequel and complement. This Introduction is also an Apologia addressed to critics who accuse him of being given to religion not too little but too much. Three of the essays here collected were first printed in the Proceedings of an association called *Union pour la Vérité*, and the second of these is itself an answer to objections raised against the first 'dans ce milieu très cultivé'. That accomplished circle seems to have been devoted to what is called Naturalism and has been thus described: 'Naturalism involves the negation of creative interference in nature and of miracle in history. It also implies, though more obscurely, the extrusion of all supernatural elements from ordinary spiritual experience—prayer becomes unmeaning, freewill becomes a polite fiction, even God and immortality fade away into shadows' (D'Arcy *Idealism and Theology* p. 52). The involved negation might be imputed to Loisy; the implied extrusion would be by no means fair. The *Union* rightly judged that he was no 'Naturalist'. The attack of a certain 'Ancien de l'Union' provoked him to some remarkable confessions about his faith, studies, and position; among others this:—

'. . . il n'a guère fait autre chose que se dégager radicalement de la tradition théologique; dans ses publications dites modernistes (1896–1908), où le point de vue intellectualiste est prédominant, il ne vise guère plus qu'un redressement scientifique de ce qu'il appelle volontiers le régime intellectuel du catholicisme, et l'absence d'une théorie positive de la religion y est assez sensible; ce que l'Ancien appelle 'sens de la foi' lui est venu en étudiant comparativement les religions, où il a pensé reconnaître quelque chose que les sociologues ont signalé mais peut-être pas exactement défini, et que les champions de la raison pure sembleraient n'avoir pas soupçonné encore, c'est-à-dire la fonction du sens mystique dans la vie de l'humanité.'

M. Loisy, scholar and priest, has been ill-used by his superiors in the Church. It is partly excusable that he should resent the injustice. It has embittered him. Bitterness against Rome has affected his later Commentaries, which are not the pure judicial works of scholarship that the earlier ones were; nor do they inflame the 'sens mystique' of the reader as those did. Something like that must be said of *L'Église et la France.* It is a vivid (and a documented) picture of the state of religion in France to-day. Yet it will be read with misgiving—is it coloured by prejudice?—and with regret for its bitterness as with delight in its wit, and with admiration and no little awe for its noble indignation, its bold intention to tell plain truth in all the departments of truth.

Baron Friedrich von Hügel: Selected Letters 1896–1924: edited with a Memoir: by Bernard Holland. (J. M. Dent & Sons, 1927.)

Mrs Holland, in the short preface dated October 1926, tells how Mr Bernard Holland died leaving the Memoir completely finished, the the Selection of Letters almost completed, but both Memoir and Selection still needing the revision which he had in his mind to do. This has been done by Mrs Holland and a friend of Baron von Hügel's, and nothing seems lacking in the faithful consummation of the pious task.

The letters begin in December 1896. Baron von Hügel was then in his forty-fifth year, already meditating *The Mystical Element of Religion*; indeed already writing that work of fifteen and fruit of thirty years' mental labour. It is a milestone in the life. Life and letters fall into three periods. The first ends with the expulsion of Loisy and the death of Tyrrell. Here all is epic: generous friendship, generous and dangerous; passionate devotion to the new learning, to truth in the soul; a morning of hope, facing of risk, a crusade. Then Tyrrell is removed by death with tragedy, and Loisy, 'that valiant Loisy', half estranged, ominously. Von Hügel draws in. A second period shews him loyal to his heritage, settled within the bulwarks of the Catholic

Church of Rome 'le savant Catholique d'aujourd'hui'; still large-hearted in friendship, notably with Troeltsch, friendships and sympathies with those outside—yet they are outside—quieter affections, inward peace. And this period is punctuated by another published book, *Eternal Life*. In the third and final period the crusader and the savant fade into the background: the 'pastoral helper of souls' (as he himself described another person) stands out. The letters of this period will be the most highly appreciated of all by the many souls whom von Hügel helped, so widely and so wisely. Perhaps this will be the most precious part of the book to that inner circle of disciples in which he was affectionately called 'The Baron', an inner circle from which a poor-spirited reader may sometimes feel, as he reads this intimate volume (both Memoir and Letters) some touch of the mean jealousy of exclusion.

Yet such readers will feel it not altogether meanly, for themselves. Rather on behalf of other heroes whom they would reverence as they have reverenced von Hügel. It is gently annoying to read von Hügel's cool judgement of Lord Acton, and his humility in acknowledging Acton's intellectual superiority does not wipe the annoyance out. There truly was intellectual superiority, more strength (with whatever limitations), a less self-conscious courtesy to those without the Roman pale, a larger recognition of 'Christendom'. Let honest confession be abruptly made that some readers of these letters will, on a first perusal, doubt the whole-hearted certainty they used to feel in the 'massive' profundity of Baron von Hügel as a thinker.

But that confession made must presently be corrected. The letters must be read again and yet again. As in a few other really good biographies, so in this biography of his master by Mr Bernard Holland: the whole man, in his real humanity, is portrayed. And real humanity always means limitations; but these, faced, studied, and affectionately valued, do not diminish, but enlarge, the heroic or divine original: a real life is an incarnation and grows fuller by condescension.

The three periods involve no breaks. Others round about him change: von Hügel is consistent in mind and character throughout. Already in the first period he perceives that Loisy is moving away from what has been, is, and always will be his own firm conviction of the transcendence of God, the givenness of Reality, its claim to adoration. He writes that he foresees the possible necessity of 'discrimination' from his friend. And the peace, the reconciliation of inward conflict which is gained in the second period, is not the result of prudence but the necessary result of patience, piety, and indefatigable complexity of meditation. For a religious thinker like von Hügel, peace and unity within is an intellectual victory, not a submission. And this peace within the Roman church was his rightful inheritance. In *The Mystical Element* he brought to clear expression what he had always known and would never come to doubt, that the 'institutional' element was (at least for him) no less necessary, no less real, than the other two, the the mystical and the critical or speculative.

He magnified his privilege, his catholic heritage, but of himself he always thought with a humility which was subsumed in love, and which disarms criticism, and puts the reader to the blush. Somewhere he writes of his *Mystical Element* that whatever may be 'the serious defects or incompletenesses of the book, long, grateful intercourse and sympathy with souls of a rare depth and delicacy of faith and love must, I think, have given some abiding substance to some of these many pages'. And he is ever thus: a disciple, hero-worshipping, referring all he has to guides and givers whom he had used with quite a passionate admiration. Perhaps there is nothing in the whole of Mr Holland's volume quite so good as the selection of notes from the Abbé Huvelin's instructions which von Hügel drew up and imparted from time to time to his own specially favoured pupils.

In these notes, these pregnant shapely aphorisms, a germ may be perceived of something which fills von Hügel's last period, the pastorate of souls, with singular charm. The letters of this period are didactic, sometimes rather long. To the inner circle, for whom perhaps the collection is especially intended, these may seem the best of all. To the less intimate reader they will prove better and better the more they are read, meditated, and reverenced: for a certain awe grows upon us in the deliberate perusal: the writer is a veritable saint and has the authority and the exquisite gentleness of a saint: he is a lord of hearts. But he is exceedingly humane, in touch with common life, sensitive to the truth of beauty. He, long-rolling writer as he is, can be aphoristic and turn creative phrases. Here are two which reveal character: 'In a world steeped in history'; 'you will be delighted with your day—with all the art and the history, all the cordiality and the deep-rooted, Benedictine *Pax*'. These pastoral letters repeat, develope, illustrate, apply, the grand main doctrines of von Hügel's devotional security: God transcendent; Religion = Adoration; Reality *given*, not made, nor discovered by man's mind, but experienced; the truth of sacraments; the bracing honesty of institutional faith. But besides that there breathes through them delight and gratitude for Nature co-operant with Grace:—

'It is quite possible (it is certainly much the more common state of soul) that your now deep and living sense of religion is making non-religious subjects more or less insipid to you—that you are feeling it rather a bore to concentrate upon Homer and Pindar, after Tertullian and the *Confessions*. But if this is so, or if it comes on, later on: I want you, my dear, *carefully to ignore, and vigorously to react against, this mentality*. If there is one danger for religion—if there is any one plausible, all-but-irresistible trend which, throughout its long rich history, has sapped its force, and prepared the most destructive counter-excesses, it is just *that*,—that allowing the fascinations of Grace to deaden or to ignore the beauties and duties of Nature. What *is* Nature? Why Nature (in this sense) is the expression of the God of Nature; just as Grace is the expression of the God of Grace. And not only are they *both* from God, and to be loved and honoured as His: but they have been created, they are administered and moved, by God as *closely inter-related parts of one great whole*—of the full and vivid knowledge and service of Him and happiness of ourselves.'

So he writes in one of a series of letters 'To G. G.', a child, girl, woman, tenderly loved, lavishly directed in religion and in literature sacred and profane. These letters make a treatise of criticism, entertaining, shrewd, broad-based, with just enough of prejudice here and there to reveal charmingly the characters of master and pupil. If only for these excursions, 'the Baron's' didactic period is radiant with scholarship.

And it must always be remembered, as this last period is examined, that yet another intellectual element is at work therein, though but perceivable by glimpses. As two books complete the first and second periods, so a third capital book was to complete the third; and it is a happiness to learn from Mr Holland that it has been left just 'not quite completed'. This book was to be called *The Reality of God.* The title promises ultimate utterance on the main theme towards which von Hügel was always bringing all his meditations together. If this 'not quite completed' work shall presently be published, it may be expected to bring the whole harmonious mind of the scholar and saint into the light of day.

Lord Acton, reviewing Flint's *Historical Philosophy in France*, concludes thus:—

'That with the trained capacity for misunderstanding and the smouldering dissent proper to critics, I might not mislead any reader, or do less than justice to a profound though indecisive work, I should have wished to piece together the passages in which the author indicates, somewhat faintly, the promised but withheld philosophy which will crown the third or fourth volume.'

The wish was generous, though expressed austerely. Readers of Baron von Hügel's Letters will not be austere: most of them will be enthusiastic. And, happily, all may entertain the hope of seeing their promise crowned by *The Reality of God.*

A. NAIRNE.

The Nature of Deity, by J. E. TURNER, M.A., Ph.D. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.)

It is possibly an injustice to Dr Turner to review this volume without having read the earlier work, *Personality and Reality*, to which it is a sequel; yet despite occasional references back the argument appears to be fairly self-contained. Only one conclusion of the earlier argument, a very pregnant one to be sure, is carried over as a premiss of the new, the conclusion that there exists a Supreme Self or Deity. 'I have argued in an earlier volume', says Dr Turner, 'that the real existence of the Supreme Self or Deity can be logically established from the *data* presented by those outstanding characteristics of the universe which have been discovered by modern science. . . . In the following chapters I shall endeavour to carry the enquiry still farther, and consider whether any more detailed results can be obtained with regard to, not the existence, but the character, of the Supreme Self.' Those who are unable to accept the conclusion of the earlier work, whether on the basis of Dr Turner's reasoning or on any other basis, will doubtless be inclined to consider the further pursuit of the topic as so much beating of air; but, fortunately perhaps for the usefulness and the appeal of the book under review, there are many thoughtful people who believe in the existence of a Supreme Self very largely on grounds other than philosophical argument, who indeed hold that belief along with considerable doubt whether in the nature of the case it could ever be logically established. To such as these the book should have an intrinsic interest and value apart from the earlier work, for it starts from a premiss which in any case they are willing to grant and in which they are profoundly interested.

But Dr Turner carries over from the earlier work not only a conclusion but also a method, and in judging what he has to say the attention fixes itself on this method, the more so as it is apparently by it that he asks to be judged. He says in the preface, 'although my final position, taken as a whole, presents little that is in any sense new, still the manner in which it is arrived at marks a departure (in my opinion) from the course hitherto adopted'. What then is the method? It consists 'in the consideration of the known features of real being rather than in any purely theoretical suggestions or hypothetical suppositions'. But is this method really new either in what it proposes to follow or in what it proposes to eschew? Neither philosophy nor theology has lacked its empirical schools, as Dr Turner is himself aware. 'It may be said', he remarks, 'that every writer adopts this method.' It turns out then that what is claimed to be new is not the method but the author's success in applying it to the particular problem under discussion. By a strictly logical pursuit of the implications of ascertained fact

Dr Turner claims to reach conclusions about the nature of the Supreme Self which are new, not in respect of their content, but in respect of the cogency of their appeal to 'the intellect, as distinguishable from the emotions, of mankind'.

This is a large claim, and the sense of its largeness is not diminished by an examination of the actual conclusions which are reached by this so austere method. It is no less than the God of enlightened Christian conviction which Dr Turner arrives at—a Supreme Self who is an omnipotent, omniscient, infinite, creative, atoning, loving Father. The meaning of these familiar attributes of Deity require, of course, from whatever angle they are approached, careful definition and discussion, and much that Dr Turner says from his own angle is valuable and worth reading, though not especially new. It is, however, the angle, the method of approach, which is the crucial thing. It is not difficult to see that starting on the one hand from the Christian conception of God as One (to use Dr Turner's own words) 'whose purpose . . . is the creation of beings capable of becoming more and more akin to Himself', and on the other hand from our empirical knowledge of human personality and the conditions under which it develops, we are inevitably shut up to certain interpretations of God's other attributes. But as I understand Dr Turner he claims to start only from the empirical conditions and yet, apparently, to reach the same conclusions. His implied rejection of the position of Ritschl and Schleiermacher on p. 17 confirms this interpretation of his argument. Does he then succeed in what he sets out to do?

I hardly think he does. I suspect that more than once he unconsciously introduces into his arguments conceptions which are derived from religious experience rather than from a strictly logical explication of those data to which he claims to restrict himself. Indeed, in one place at least, the appeal to religious experience is almost disconcerting in its frankness. Discussing the correct use of the terms 'universe' and 'supreme' in relation to the conception of Deity, Dr Turner asks us to accept his own proposed use of the terms for the reason, among others, that it 'confers on Him that quite unique status which accords with one of the main tendencies of worship'. In the same connexion he says, 'it must then be admitted from the outset that the essence of what is implied by this expression of the religious attitude must be conserved by philosophy'. There is a vagueness and ambiguity in this double use of the word 'must' which one has an uncomfortable feeling may cover a real incoherence of thought. Why *must* philosophy conserve what is implied by this or any other expression of the religious attitude? If it is because it is forced to by logical inference from its own data, well and good; but if that is what is meant, why *must* it be admitted *from the outset*, and in connexion with a discussion of definitions? Definitions are not data nor inferences from data. One cannot quite make out whether Dr Turner means to include the deliverances of religious experience among his data or not. On the whole it seems he does not mean to do so, in which case the charge must be brought that he actually does so without knowing it, and that that is partly the reason why he is able to reach the conclusions that he does reach about the nature of Deity.

The point can be further indicated from another curiously ambiguous sentence which suddenly appears in the course of the argument. On p. 130 occur these words: 'the present issues must be treated throughout with direct reference to the necessities of the *human* mind, not from some position altogether foreign to this; and they are best approached, as before, by means of analogies drawn from familiar experience. If these finally lead to conclusions which satisfy the demands both of man's intellect and his emotional nature, they must be accepted as fully adequate, since any other criterion would be unnatural and therefore illogical.' Here we are introduced to two fresh standards of knowledge, ambiguous in themselves and difficult to accommodate to the standard set out at the beginning of the book where it is said that the method of argument must be the strictly logical consideration of the known features of real being. Conclusions must now satisfy both 'man's intellect and his emotional nature', and what is 'unnatural' is 'illogical'. It is no disrespect to Dr Turner to confess to something akin to amazement at this sudden definition of 'illogical' by what is surely one of the most slippery and ambiguous terms which have ever hindered thought, the term 'natural'. And what is to be made of this sudden assumption of a theory of knowledge involving man's emotional nature, a theory which is not only not discussed, but seems to run counter to what the book claims especially to do, namely, to appeal to the intellect rather than to the emotions? One is left doubting how much of the cogency of the argument for the author has been derived from 'the will to believe logically', and how much from the seeking of satisfaction for his emotional nature.

The doubt is not dispelled by an examination of the argument itself. It is almost wholly an argument from analogy. Given that the Deity is the Supreme Self, the question what is the nature of that Self is answered mainly by analogy from what we know of human selves and of their relations to the world. Now the trouble about argument from analogy is that it is apt to assume the very thing which really requires demonstration. Only if we already know that in its essential structure and relations to the universe the Supreme Self is like ourselves can we legitimately carry that knowledge farther by analogy? Dr Turner himself admits the enormous incomprehensibility which must ever remain for us in the Divine Nature; but he argues that it is not of such a kind as seriously to impair the validity of analogical reasoning. In other words he believes that the nature of the Divine Self is not, so to say, radically affected by the fact that it is Divine; in thinking of Divine and human selves we can concentrate on the fact of selfhood and ignore the utter disparateness suggested by the two defining adjectives attached. This is a tremendous belief, and on it the whole argument hinges. How does Dr Turner know that the incomprehensible in God is not such as to destroy the cogency of the argument from analogy? Perhaps here the disqualification of not having read the earlier work enters in. Yet even in this work Dr Turner is still apparently perturbed by the question, for he adverts to it more than once, and for illumination upon it we are referred back to an earlier section of the book under review. So far as I understand Dr Turner he seeks to establish the validity of analogical reasoning against the objection raised above by the fact of evolution. Just as there are essential continuity and yet emergence of transcendent difference in the course of human evolution from its primitive levels up to the level of a Newton or a Shakespeare, so there is the same essential continuity with transcendent difference between man's mind and God's. But this is surely only another application of analogical reasoning and therefore carries us no nearer to the establishment of the fundamental proposition upon which analogical reasoning of any kind must rest.

The fact is that this fundamental proposition, the proposition that man's nature and God's are essentially akin, cannot ever be proved from an examination of such data as those which Dr Turner seeks to make the basis of his argument, and we only persuade ourselves it can by reading into the data a religious conviction which has its roots elsewhere. It is because Dr Turner is not aware of this, or, if he disputes its validity, does not clearly and adequately deal with it, that his argument seems so unconvincing and at times confused. Yet if this be the weakness of the book, it also in a way indicates its value. As was said at the beginning, to those who have already a conviction of the essential affinity of God's nature with man's, despite the infinite mystery of His being, Dr Turner's sketch of a possible way of conceiving that nature in the light of such knowledge as we have will be illuminating and will help to give that basis in reflection which every thoughtful religious faith demands. In short, my criticism is that Dr Turner claims to have done more than he really has done, but I do not mean by that that he has done nothing at all. The book forces one to think again over some of the age-long puzzles of theistic faith and philosophy.

HERBERT H. FARMER.

Revelation and Inspiration, by BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD. pp. 456. (Humphrey Milford, 1927.)

DR BENJAMIN WARFIELD of Princeton, who died in 1921, had established his reputation as a learned and painstaking student of the New Testament, and in particular as a tireless champion of the old orthodoxies. His literary executors propose to collect and publish a large number of his contributions to theological journals, and in this the first volume have gathered ten articles all bearing on the inspiration of Scripture. They make pathetic reading. The inspiration of the sacred books implies 'the dogma that they are verbally from God' (p. 419). Being such they are absolutely free from error. 'No case can be adduced where a natural method of harmonizing cannot be adduced' (p. 415). 'If we cannot harmonize without straining let us leave them unharmonized' (p. 219). If any one is interested in the mental pathology of fundamentalism he cannot do better than examine this work of a good scholar and a good man, who thought mistakenly that his Christian faith stood or fell with an inerrant Bible.

The Case for Christianity, by CLEMENT F. ROGERS. (George Allen, London, 1928.)

THIS is an excellent book for its purpose, which is accurately described in the sub-title, 'An Outline of Popular Apologetics'. The writer is equipped beyond most for dealing with the real difficulties, or with the captious objections of the man in the parks, or the man in the club. For many years he has specialized in direct contact and discussion with those who in public places challenge Christianity or certain of the doctrines ascribed to it. To various forms and aspects of this challenge he offers here a reply which is clear, conciliatory, and persuasive. The arrangement is good. He begins with a chapter in which he shews the necessity for society of the Christian view of life, and works through chapters on the Credibility of the Records and the Historical Jesus to the more abstract topics such as Conscience and Theism. Not the least valuable feature in the book is the wealth of quotations given in the notes, all apposite and many piquant, drawn from sources which range from Plato to Jane and Anne Taylor. An Appendix on 'The Uneducated Mind' is interesting but melancholy reading, which should give our educationalists seriously to think. The book should not be overlooked by any one whose duty it is to commend Christianity to his fellow-men.

C. ANDERSON SCOTT.

The Cambridge Platonists: a study, by Frederick J. Powicke, M.A. Ph.D. (J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London, 1926.)

This is an admirable book, excellently suited to its purpose; which is to make available to a wider circle of readers the writings of the Christian Platonists of seventeenth-century Cambridge. Most of the books of these men are hard to come by; and their erudition, which caused them to sprinkle their pages with quotations, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, to-day serves often to obscure rather than to adorn. But the present book, with its full and well-chosen extracts, gives the ordinary reader just what he requires.

The book has an object somewhat different from Campagnac's *Selections*. An introductory section puts the reader into touch with the Cambridge of the period and introduces him to 'Some characteristics of the Cambridge Platonists'. Then follow chapters dealing with the chief figures in turn: Whichcote, Smith, Cudworth, Culverwell, More; and with them is the less familiar Peter Sterry, Cromwell's chaplain. Each chapter opens with a brief biographical account; and thereafter quotations, with comment where necessary, allow the authors to speak for themselves. The extracts are chosen for their intrinsic merit and present value, rather than as a basis for the systematic study of the thought of the writers. Here Dr Powicke has had a pleasant task, for the temptation to quote these men is irresistible. And indeed they cannot be quoted too often. The selection, moreover, is happily made, as it brings out what is most characteristic of these 'latitudinarian' Platonists: their moral earnestness and their faith in reason, with the conviction of the fundamental harmony of the two. 'A Man has as much Right to use his *own Understanding*, in judging of Truth; as he has a Right to use his own Eyes, to see his way.' Reason is the 'very Voice of God'. Yet 'the oracle of God, is not to be heard but in His holy temple—that is to say, in a good and holy man, thoroughly sanctified in spirit, soul, and body'. *Amor dei lux animae.* 'This life is nothing else but God's own breath within him and an infant Christ (if I may use the expression) formed in his soul.' Hence 'Divinity is not so well perceiv'd by a subtile wit, *ὥσπερ αἰσθήσει κεκαθαρμένῃ as by a purified sense*, as *Plotinus* phraseth it'.

The interest of the book is enhanced by reproductions of Loggan's prints of contemporary Cambridge and of portraits of More and Whichcote.[1]

---

[1] Misprints on pp. 65 and 109 (Greek).

The Ethics of the Gospel and the Ethics of Nature, by H. H. SCULLARD, M.A., D.D. (Lond.), with a Preface by Principal A. E. GARVIE, D.D. (Student Christian Movement, London, 1927.)

THE author of this book, who did not live to see its publication, was impressed by the absence, as it seemed to him, of any religious foundation to modern morals and civilization. His book, written from a strongly evangelical protestant standpoint, is an attempt 'to draw attention again to those fundamental principles of Christian morality, which have distinguished it most clearly from all other types of ethical theory', and so to help in the reconstruction required.

The title is intended to mark an antithesis; and upon it the discussion turns. The 'ethics of the Gospel' are described in chapters on the New Testament. Critical methods are recognized; yet texts are quoted indiscriminately. The remainder of the book contains a rapid historical sketch of moral ideas and theories, the thesis being that the Gospel ethics were eclipsed by the fruitless attempt to find a basis for morals in 'Nature' instead of in the 'Gospel'. But nowhere is the meaning or validity of this antithesis clearly discussed. The historical summary is too brief to admit of a profitable account in detail of the periods and thinkers touched on; whilst the method of it, with its crowded references, excludes such a survey of the broader tendencies as space-limits might have allowed of. Scant justice is done to some of the greater thinkers, who are mentioned only to be dismissed as having, one and all, sought in 'Nature' what only the Gospel can give. The author felt keenly the need of a renewed understanding of the ethics of Christianity; but it is not in this way that such a reconstruction will be achieved.

J. S. BOYS-SMITH.

Les Livres d'Heures manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, by ABBÉ V. LEROQUAIS. (Paris, 1927; 2 vols. and 130 plates.)

M. LEROQUAIS, à qui nous devons un excellent catalogue des sacramentaires et missels manuscrits conservés dans les bibliothèques publiques de France (1924), a entrepris de faire connaître, selon un plan analogue, les livres d'Heures de la Bibliothèque Nationale. La méthode est la même, simple, précise, prudente; mais, évidemment, les résultats ne pouvaient offrir cette fois, vu le sujet, le même intérêt.

Car il ne faut pas se faire d'illusions. Dans sa charmante et spirituelle introduction, bien conduite, écrite plutôt pour l'homme cultivé que pour l'érudit spécialiste, l'auteur, emporté sans doute par le zèle qui l'a soutenu lui-même dans une longue étude, fait un grand

éloge, un peu excessif, des livres d'Heures. Toute la piété des derniers siècles du moyen âge s'y refléterait. 'A travers cette littérature un peu touffue—dit-il par exemple—on sent palpiter l'âme populaire.' Il y a lieu, selon nous, d'en rabattre beaucoup. Au xv^e siècle, le livre d'Heures a fourni aux peintres de miniatures l'occasion d'exercer leur talent ; car cette catégorie d'ouvrages, destinée aux laïques, et presque toujours aux laïques fortunés, est remplie d'illustrations et devait l'être. Par suite, si, très souvent, nous n'avons qu'une médiocre décoration, parfois des chefs-d'œuvre remarquables ont été produits par de grands artistes, tels notamment les fameux livres exécutés pour Jean duc de Berry, le frère du roi Charles V. En ce sens, les livres d'Heures ne sont pas négligeables ; loin de là, ils sont, dans une période limitée, c'est-à-dire au xv^e siècle, et, pour une part, au xvi^e, les plus magnifiques monuments de l'histoire de l'art. Mais, quant au texte, il faut bien avouer que ces recueils sont, ordinairement, d'une extrême banalité, étant composés pour la plupart selon le même type. Exceptionellement, c'est-à-dire dans la mesure où ils renferment des prières particulières, qui proviennent des *Libelli precum*, ils offrent quelque intérêt littéraire à l'historien du culte. Cette remarque importante remet les choses au point ; en tant que livre de piété—nous ne disons pas, en tant que livre liturgique (car il ne s'agit exactement que d'un bréviaire réduit à l'usage des laïques, comme M. Leroquais l'indique bien)—le livre d'Heures a fort peu à nous apprendre, dès lors que ses origines ont été déterminées.

L'auteur n'a pas manqué de rappeler les études déjà parues en ce pays sur son sujet : l'article si suggestif d'Edmund Bishop *On the origin of the Prymer* (1897), réimprimé dans *Liturgica Historica* (1918) ; l'utile bibliographie d'Edgar Hoskins relative aux *Sarum and York Primers* (1901) ; enfin, les *Horae Eboracenses*, admirablement éditées par Canon Chr. Wordsworth pour la Surtees Society (1920, vol. cxxxii). Car c'est là presque toute la littérature concernant les livres d'Heures, avec une étude remarquable de L. Delisle *Les Livrés d'images destinés à l'instruction religieuse et aux exercices de piété des laïques* (dans l'*Histoire littéraire de la France*, xxxi, 1893, pp. 213–285). Il est vrai, en effet, que l'Angleterre possède probablement plus d'*anciens* livres d'Heures que la France (voir en particulier le catalogue des manuscrits de Mr Dyson Perrins par Sir G. Warner, 1920, i, pp. 12 sq.). Enfin, n'oublions pas que ce sont des érudits anglais, F. Madan et H. M. Bannister, qui les premiers ont recherché la méthode qui permettrait de classer les innombrables livres d'Heures d'après leur lieu d'origine (cf. *The Bodleian Quarterly Record*, juillet 1920, pp. 40 sq.).

On est surpris que M. Leroquais ne mentionne pas dans son introduction un ouvrage semblable au sien à beaucoup d'égards, et trop souvent oublié on ne sait pourquoi : le catalogue des *Livres d'Heures imprimés au* XV^e *et au* XVI^e *siècle conservés dans les bibliothèques publiques de Paris*, par Paul Lacombe (1907). Car, à partir de la fin du XV^e siècle (depuis 1486 environ), les imprimés commencent de faire aux manuscrits une sérieuse concurrence qui laisse prévoir la défaite prochaine de ces derniers ; et leur intérêt est, généralement, de préciser 'l'usage' local auquel ils correspondent. Nous aurions surtout voulu que, à l'exemple de son devancier, M. Leroquais ait compris dans son plan l'étude des Heures qui existent encore dans les collections des bibliothèques Mazarine, Sainte-Geneviève et de l'Arsenal. Est-il trop tard pour l'inviter à compléter ainsi son enquête, et à l'achever même, en parcourant de nouveau les Départements, comme il a fait pour les missels, et comme il vient de promettre de faire également pour les bréviaires manuscrits ?

En attendant, il faut bien se contenter de ce qu'on nous offre généreusement, et nous ne voulons pas avoir l'air d'être ingrats, en nous plaignant immodérément. Il reste vrai que la Bibliothèque Nationale est, sans doute, la collection qui renferme les plus nombreux livres d'Heures et les plus beaux. Ne pourraient rivaliser avec elle, à cet égard, croyons-nous, que le British Museum et la Fitzwilliam Library de Cambridge. De ce point de vue, les renseignements que M. Leroquais nous fournit avec abondance sont instructifs pour tous ceux qui s'intéressent à cette catégorie d'ouvrages.

D'après le compte de l'auteur, les divers fonds de la Bibliothèque Nationale ('Latin', 'Français', 'Nouvelles Acquisitions' latines et françaises) comprennent au total 309 exemplaires manuscrits. Le catalogue de M. Leroquais énumère en réalité 313 notices ; mais il convient de retrancher les 'Heures de Louis XIV' (*Lat. 9476–9477*), qui ne sont autre chose qu'un missel et un vespéral ; d'autre part, les Heures du sire de Joinville (*N. Acq. fr. 4509–4510*) ne formaient à l'origine qu'un seul volume, et de même celles de Guillaume de Bade (*Lat. 10567–10568*). Nous espérons que le dénombrement est complet ; car M. Leroquais ne nous dit rien des procédés qu'il a employés pour reconnaître les Heures proprement dites de l'ancien fonds latin, que le catalogue de 1744 ne désigne pas d'une manière certaine. En d'autres termes, nous aurions aimé avoir une liste parallèle des divers *Libelli precum* ou *Orationales* de la Bibliothèque Nationale qui ne doivent pas être confondus avec les livres d'Heures. Si l'on s'en tient donc à la statistique proposée, les 309 manuscrits étudiés se répartissent de la façon suivante.

Les plus anciens sont deux manuscrits qui peuvent être rapportés à la seconde moitié du XII^e siècle, et dans lesquels les Heures font suite au psautier : *Lat. 1079*, provenant de la région rhénane (Trèves ou Aix-la-Chapelle), et *Lat. 10433*, beau volume d'origine anglaise qui, au xive siècle, appartenait à l'abbaye de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif, au diocèse de Sens. De ce dernier livre, M. Leroquais se borne à dire qu'il 'fut exécuté en Angleterre ainsi qu'on peut le déduire du calendrier et des litanies', et qu'il était à l'usage 'd'une abbaye bénédictine'. D'après les indications qu'il donne, il nous paraît qu'on ne saurait guère hésiter à le rapporter à l'église de Cantorbéry.

Le xiiie siècle fournit sept manuscrits seulement : cinq où les Heures sont jointes au psautier et qui proviennent tous du nord de la France ou de Belgique (Arras, Saint-Amand, Guines, Liège: *Lat. 1073 A*, *1077*, *1328*, *13235*, *13260*), et deux livres d'Heures distincts, l'un représentant l'usage de Passau en Bavière et pouvant être rapporté au commencement du xiiie siècle (*Lat. 10526*), l'autre représentant l'usage de Thérouanne et attribuable à la fin du xiiie siècle (*Lat. 14284*). De ses faits, on peut tirer, semble-t-il, au moins provisoirement, une conclusion que M. Leroquais ne paraît pas avoir eu le souci d'indiquer. C'est dans le nord de la France que les livres d'Heures ont commencé d'apparaître, c'est donc aussi de là qu'ils ont dû se répandre, peu à peu, dans les autres provinces. Mais il reste à savoir si la France n'a pas reçu d'ailleurs ce complément du psautier ; et, en ce cas, n'y aurait-il pas lieu de chercher le point de départ en Angleterre ?

Au xive siècle, les livres d'Heures ne sont pas encore nombreux et, cependant, le souvenir des origines littéraires s'efface déjà presque complètement. On ne remarque plus en effet, parmi les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, que deux psautiers de cette époque auxquels des Heures soient attachées (*Lat. 1082* et *N. Acq. lat. 1017*). Au xve siècle, qui est le temps de la pleine diffusion, on ne trouvera plus à noter que six exemples de l'arrangement primitif, dus sans doute à une imitation servile des modèles plus anciens. Outre les deux psautiers, M. Leroquais indique (p. xii et cf. p. xl) neuf volumes qui seraient les seuls témoins de l'usage des Heures pour le xive siècle. Il y a là quelque malentendu bizarre ; de plus, *Lat. 13264* (Heures de Rome) doit être une fausse référence, au lieu de *Lat. 1364* (Heures de Tournai). Si l'on prend la peine de parcourir les notices, on compte au juste 22 livres assignés au xive siècle, dont 14 sont rapportés soit à la seconde moitié soit à la fin du siècle, les autres étant antérieurs.[1]

---

[1] Cette série mérite d'être retenue ; l'astérisque dénote les livres donnés comme tardifs: *Lat. 757**, *1082**, *1342**, *1352**, *1361*, *1864**, *1394**, *1398**, *1403**, *10527**, *10528**, *10529**, *13261**, *18014**; *N. Acq. Lat. 385*, *560*, *592*, *915*, *962*, *1016*, *1017*; *N. Acq. Fr. 4509–10**. Du point de vue géographique, on pourrait tracer la ligne suivante, mis à part les Heures françaises de Joinville (dernier article) : Tournai, Flandres ou Picardie, Metz (2 mss.), Reims, Prémontré, Paris (8 mss.), Fontevrault (?), Poitiers, Elne, Avignon (?), Italie (3 mss.).

La grande majorité de ce qui reste appartient au xv^e^ siècle. Pour avoir une idée à peu près exacte de cette tradition, il suffit de distinguer les 38 manuscrits qui dateraient des dernières années du xv^e^ siècle, les 36 qui valent pour le xvi^e^ (dont 21 sont rapportés au commencement du siècle), enfin les Heures de Guillaume de Bade, composées en 1647, et celles de Marie-Antoinette qui ne s'éloignent pas trop du type commun (*N. Acq. Fr. 1825*).

Notons enfin que, dans cette vaste collection, l'Angleterre n'est représentée, après le psautier du xii^e^ siècle, que par des Heures de Salisbury, riches en prières de dévotion, mais d'une exécution modeste, qui remontent soit à la fin du xiv^e^ siècle soit, plus probablement (selon M. Leroquais), à la première moitié du siècle suivant (*Lat. 13285*).

La vraie difficulté de la tâche était d'identifier, c'est-à-dire, proprement, de localiser les manuscrits, quand les données positives qu'on peut tirer parfois du calendrier, des litanies, des prières, des armoiries, font défaut ou manquent de netteté. M. Leroquais a réussi néanmoins, dans la plupart des cas, à définir 'l'usage' particulier des Heures qu'il a pris soin d'examiner. C'est un magnifique résultat, devant lequel on ne saurait lui marchander les compliments, et qui encouragera sans doute d'autres travailleurs. Il n'a pu, malheureusement, qu'indiquer dans son Introduction (pp. xxxvi sqq.) la méthode observée, le détail des faits dépassant entièrement le cadre d'un catalogue. En élargissant le système proposé par F. Madan et H. M. Bannister, qui laissait trop souvent place à certaines confusions, on finit par distinguer, grâce aux Heures imprimées surtout, plus de deux cents variétés de l'office de la Vierge, représentant chacune pour son compte, avec une fixité absolue, l'usage des divers diocèses, monastères et collégiales. Le procédé consiste à relever les 29 amorces ou *Initia* des hymnes, antiennes et capitules qui entrent dans la composition des heures. Il est clair que ces listes vaudraient la peine d'être publiées ; l'avantage serait immédiat de pouvoir établir presque à coup sûr la provenance d'innombrables manuscrits enluminés. M. Leroquais avait déjà usé avec succès d'une méthode semblable pour classer les missels, suivant les versets d'*Alleluia* qui sont marqués pour les dimanches après la Pentecôte. Il fait remarquer de plus, à l'occasion des livres d'Heures, que la série des neuf répons employés aux matines de l'office des morts fournirait des distinctions non moins concluantes. On aurait donc là un moyen, aussi facile que sûr, de localiser non seulement les livres d'Heures, mais encore les antiphonaires et les bréviaires. Encore un peu de patience, à l'exemple de M. Leroquais, et la littérature liturgique du moyen âge, farouche au premier abord, n'aura plus de secrets pour l'historien.

On nous reprocherait justement de clore cette notice sans accorder une mention au beau volume des planches. Celles-ci, au nombre de 130 et, pour la plupart, à grandeur d'original, correspondent, suivant l'ordre chronologique, à 44 manuscrits, et complètent d'une façon satisfaisante le commentaire général donné dans l'Introduction et les détails des notices. Entre tant de chefs-d'œuvre réputés, il était malaisé de faire un choix; il nous semble que le recueil de M. Leroquais peut donner à l'étudiant une idée suffisante des richesses de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Tous les plus fameux manuscrits fournissent quelque spécimen, et souvent plusieurs; les incomparables Heures de Laval (*Lat. 920*), que M. Leroquais s'interdit d'attribuer à Fouquet, sont les mieux partagées, avec 13 planches. La première reproduction de la série est empruntée au psautier anglais que nous proposons de rattacher à Cantorbéry; les trois dernières font ressortir le terme final du genre, dans le curieux livre de Guillaume de Bade, exécuté en 1647 par F. Brentel sur le modèle de tableaux flamands et hollandais. Ajoutons que l'Introduction comprend (pp. l–lxxxiv) une liste alphabétique, admirablement précise et qui rendra les plus grands services, de tous les sujets traités dans les peintures. En outre, M. Leroquais a fort bien déterminé les deux cycles d'images, l'un relatif à l'enfance, l'autre relatif à la passion du Christ, qui ornent habituellement les livres d'Heures. On s'étonne d'autant plus qu'il n'ait pas eu l'idée de reproduire une illustration homogène et typique de ces groupes d'après quelqu'un des meilleurs témoins.

A. WILMART.

The Making of Luke–Acts, by HENRY J. CADBURY. (Macmillan & Co., 1927.)

DR CADBURY has supplemented his important detailed contributions to the criticism of the language and style of the Lucan writings by a more popular study of the work and personality of the author. The aim has been 'to recover some features of his character, to visualize the other factors which went into his noteworthy undertaking, to illustrate from his contemporaries the methods of composition that he employed, and so to give as clear, comprehensive and realistic a picture as possible of the whole literary process that produced Luke and Acts'. The 368 pages of this book contain a copious collection of illustrative material from Greek and other sources, much of which will be found valuable to scholars as well as interesting to the general reader. But the general reader, as well as the scholar, is likely to complain that Dr Cadbury hardly fulfils his promise of giving a 'realistic

picture' of the making of Luke–Acts, and, if the reader makes his first approach to the critical study of the Lucan writings under Dr Cadbury's guidance, he may well be sceptical as to whether a 'realistic picture' is attainable. For Dr Cadbury draws few tangible conclusions from the parallels he adduces, and holds no general theory as to the transmission of the Gospel tradition. The written, like the oral, transmission of the events is, in his opinion, probably to be regarded as 'a peculiar unexpected, not to say providential surprise, unaccountable from the situation itself' (p. 29). A striking example of Dr Cadbury's unwillingness to commit himself occurs at the end of his chapter on 'Immediate written sources'. After giving reasons for thinking it improbable that Luke translated direct from Aramaic sources, he comes to the apparently definite conclusion that 'the current solution of the synoptic problem points explicitly to Luke's work as compiled in Greek on the basis of Greek sources'. I suppose no scholar would dissent. But the reader is left completely, and surely quite unjustifiably, baffled when Dr Cadbury continues a few lines lower down: 'In the main, therefore, we must be content to rest ignorant of the scope and of the language of each of the sources from which Luke drew. That they were largely written, and written in Greek, is the safest conjecture—though only a conjecture' (p. 75).

The preface makes a modest apology for the absence of 'profuse bibliographical references'. In point of fact the book contains extensive references to recent literature. But it is disappointing that Loisy's *L'Évangile selon Luc* (1924) was not in Dr Cadbury's hands when he wrote (see p. 6 n. 2). Probably he would not be sympathetic towards Loisy's view of the Gospel, for he urges that Norden's and Loisy's theory of the composition of Acts does not do justice to the literary homogeneity of the whole work. It should be noted, however, that Dr Cadbury misrepresents Loisy's theory (p. 6). Loisy does not hold—and did not hold in *Les Actes des Apôtres* (1920)—that the third Canonical Gospel is by the author of the principal source of Acts. His view is that a valuable and conscientious historical work underlies both books, and that both books as we have them have been subjected to an ecclesiastical redaction.

Dr Cadbury adheres to the positions which he has stated in his earlier publications. He thinks 'it is quite probable that Luke's avowed purpose, so far as his preface expresses it, is to correct misinformation about Christianity rather than, as is so often supposed, to confirm the historical basis of Theophilus's religious faith'. I do not note any reference to Mr Colson's searching criticism in this JOURNAL for April 1923 of Dr Cadbury's argument in *The Beginnings of Christianity* from the language of the preface, nor yet a reply to

Mr Colson's contention that Dr Cadbury reads into ancient 'rhetoric' a modern connotation.

On the question of authorship Dr Cadbury restates his argument that the tradition of Lucan authorship probably derives from a critical guess of the second century based entirely upon the internal evidence of the documents concerned. In this Dr Cadbury differs from most scholars. Although Lucan authorship for Luke–Acts is seriously contested, there is a general disposition to believe that the tradition has some foundation in fact. Thus Loisy holds that Luke the Physician was the original *auctor ad Theophilum*, and Windisch in *The Beginnings of Christianity* states his belief that the author of Luke–Acts used a travel diary by Luke. Dr Cadbury dissents. He thinks that the book circulated in early days without an author's name; an author's name was probably first discovered by the literary and historical curiosity of the second-century Church which had nothing more to go on than the evidence of the writings themselves. The *data* on which this conclusion was based were as follows:—

(1) The Gospel and Acts have the same author.

(2) The 'we' sections in Acts imply that the author was himself present at part of what is related in Acts, including Paul's last two years at Rome.

(3) As a corollary to this understanding of the 'we' passages, it was inferred that where 'we' is not used the author was not an eye-witness. Identification of the author with an apostle was thus, in spite of all tendency in that direction, perforce excluded as impossible.

(4) According to 2 Tim. iv 11, believed by the ancients to be a genuine letter of Paul, Luke was at one time the only Christian companion with Paul in Rome.

Dr Cadbury anticipates that the same prejudice which led Tertullian to denounce Marcion for his omission of 'full title and due declaration of authorship' will stir the 'orthodoxy' of to-day to discover 'heresy' in his own scepticism. But Dr Cadbury is no mere sceptic; he has offered us a constructive theory as to the origin of the tradition of Lucan authorship, and at present there seem to be respectable and sufficient reasons why we should hesitate before accepting this theory. No doubt the *data* which he tabulates were consistent with the assumption of Lucan authorship in the second century as they are in the twentieth. But if there were no tradition of Lucan authorship to start with, what grounds could the supposed second-century critics allege for their confidence that the *auctor ad Theophilum* remained with Paul until the end?

J. M. Creed.

L'Épitre de Saint Jacques, by J. Cheyne. (Études Bibliques, Paris, 1927.)

Those who know the Commentaries of Père Lagrange on the Gospels will appreciate his pupil's grateful recognition of his debt to his master and of happy days spent at the *École Biblique* of Jerusalem. The pupil's work is clearly modelled on that of the master. And if it reveals as clearly the hand of the disciple rather than the mind of the master, it is based on adequate scholarship, diligent study, and wide knowledge of the literature of the subject.

The author's position is clear throughout. The decisions of the Council of Trent and the Biblical Commission are final. An early example from the Introduction may serve to indicate the method and character of the work. The student may not agree with the dictum that 'the Silence of the Muratorian Canon, which does not mention the Epistle, and of Later Ecclesiastical authors who do not appear to use it before the second half of the Fourth Century, is not a "decisive difficulty" in view of its use by Clement and Hermes'. He cannot complain that the facts are concealed; the passages of Clement and Hermes are set out so that he can judge for himself. There have been differences of opinion about the Apostolic character of James the Lord's Brother, and they are stated: the paragraph ends with the statement that the Council of Trent has identified James the Lord's Brother, Bishop of Jerusalem, and James the Apostle, 'evidently the son of Alphaeus'.

The Introduction contains a long and elaborate comparison of the Epistle with other parts of the New Testament and of the Old. The writer's debt to the O.T. is worked out at great length, though without corresponding addition to our knowledge of the subject. His debt to Greek sources is not ignored, but treated far more slightly. After all our knowledge of the Diatribe is slight as compared with what can be known of Jewish thought and literature.

The Commentary is of the same quality as the Introduction: learned, laborious, scholarly, but it must be confessed not very illuminating. It provides adequate instruction to those who would learn. It hardly carries us forward towards the solution of the problems which are raised by the Epistle of St James.

A. E. Brooke.

The Gospel According to Mark in the Ancient Armenian, edited from the oldest manuscripts by ALBERT J. EDMUNDS. (The Ideal Press, Ardmore, Pa., 1926.)

THE Gospel According to Mark, 'in the Ancient Armenian' and 'edited from the oldest manuscripts', excites interest even though it comes from Ardmore, Pa. In the Preface 'for the beginner' at the end of the volume (p. 10) we read: 'Our present work is to reprint the Moscow manuscript of 887 (A.D.) from the phototype. Where this reports a blur or a mutilation, we fall back upon the Philadelphia Gospel manuscript of 1649, owned by John P. Peters (Bedrosian)'. Nothing could be better. But on p. 6 from the beginning we read another story: 'Our present text is that of Zohrabian (Venice, 1805), as reprinted by the American Bible Society (Constantinople, 1895), but the opening and the close of the Gospel are taken from the best and oldest manuscripts'. In other words Mr Edmunds's book is merely a piece of propaganda in favour of editing the Armenian Mark without 'son of God' in i 1, with 'in Isaiah the Prophet' in i 2 (instead of 'in the Prophets'), and without the Appendix at the end, finishing the Gospel at xvi 8.

As he had to print the whole Gospel in Armenian he might have set it up word for word with the photograph of the Moscow codex or the more modern MS at Philadelphia, and thereby produced something of value to the textual critic. As it is, his text has no more value than that of Zohrab from which it is taken, and of which it seems a pretty accurate reprint.

In the margin is a division (copied from Zohrab) into seven chapters with subdivisions, the last (vii 7) extending from Mk xiv 1 to 25. The next verse (xiv 26), without explanation, is marked WDsh: I suppose this stands for *werdsh*, i.e. τέλοσ. Mr Edmunds dedicates his book (among others) to 'Zohrabian'. This, as appears from p. 6, is none other than the Armenian Mechitarist Zohrab, who edited the Bible of 1805. I do not know which spelling is right. On the title-page of the Bible the name (in an oblique case) is spelt *Zōhrapean*, but he himself when writing in French calls himself *Zohrab*, in Latin *Zohrabius*, while his younger contemporary Aucher calls him in Latin *Zohrab* without declension.

F. C. BURKITT.

La Religion des Tupinamba. Par A. Métraux. (Leroux, Paris, 1928.)

The name of Tupinamba, though it applies more precisely to the Tupi tribes formerly inhabiting the neighbourhood of Rio de Janeiro, is here used of the whole linguistic group known usually as the Tupi-Guarani, whose culture would appear to have been at all times very similar, despite their utter lack of political cohesion. This culture being more or less completely a thing of the past, the student has to fall back on early descriptions such as notably those of Thevet who in 1550 and 1554 visited Brazil and proved himself a most competent observer of the native customs. M. Métraux has been fortunate enough to discover in the Bibliothèque Nationale some unpublished material by this author which supplements his known writings in various important respects, and more especially throws fresh light on the ritual cannibalism of this people. Now there are doubtless many points of scientific interest which an old-world traveller, unversed in the methods of comparative psychology, was bound to ignore in considering the religion of primitive folk; and to a corresponding extent the present work is unsatisfying, failing as it does for the most part to reveal the inner springs of the curious practices so faithfully reported. There is something to be said, on the other hand, in favour of a wholly naïve account of things as they were objectively presented, since otherwise gratuitous interpretations are apt to masquerade as facts, the obliging savage being always quite ready to supply whatever answer is suggested to him.

For instance, it is stated on the authority of more than one witness that the *couvade* was understood by the natives themselves as 'une manifestation symbolique du rôle du père dans l'acte de la génération'. If this means that it was intended as a formal recognition of paternity by a sort of consecration—by insistence on its nature as a mystic bond—one may suspect that the theorist intent on proving how father-right developes out of mother-right has given a twist to the almost sub-conscious view that the father, mother, and baby as close associates must come under one and the same *tabu* enjoining spiritual retreat during the critical period of child-birth. It is, however, simply a question of evidence. For instance, one here reads that the women of the tribe treat the retirement of the husband to his hammock as a genuine lying-in, 'le consolant sur la peine et la douleur qu'il a eues de faire cet enfant'. If this were true, it would certainly seem to bear out the contention that fatherhood is being as it were levelled-up to motherhood by an effort of symbolism. But is it true? Several authorities are cited, who may, however, be repeating the same tale. Nothing short of the report of an eye-witness conversant with the native language would settle the matter. It is also to be noted that the judicious Thevet duly mentions the abstinences of the father without assigning any other motive than their supposed effect on the health of the child.

About the anthropophagy, the most gruesome details are given, and there can be no doubt that thus literally to feed their wrath was part of the ritual of the vendetta as practised not only by this group of tribes but also by their neighbours the Caribs whose name supplies the root alike of Caliban and cannibal. Indeed, a recent work (F. Strauss, *Schiggi Schiggi*, Hutchinson, 1928) alleges on the testimony of a German explorer that in the hinterland of Bolivia the practice survives in all its pristine vigour. What added to its horror among the Tupinamba was the way in which the prisoner of war was treated almost as one of themselves, even being provided with a wife, until such time as his sacrifice was due, when he must submit to be dressed up for the part of victim and listen to a full account of all that he was about to suffer. His part was to maintain that stoic indifference so characteristic of the American Indian and to answer taunt for taunt up to the last. One cannot expect to find among these rude hunters the elaborate theology which provided a justification of the rite of human sacrifice in Mexico and the other regions of intensive culture; but that a war-custom underlies the whole complex of such practices in America would seem very likely.

In a brief notice such as this it must suffice to note one more curious observance, namely, what may be termed the tearful greeting ('la salutation larmoyante'). The custom is widely diffused east of the Andes, and on the face of it is just a native way of showing a polite interest in the arrival of a stranger—one which by the way is more to the taste of a European than an alternative method, equally ceremonial in intention, but all too easily misunderstood, of pretending to assault him violently. As for the weeping form of salutation, it is certainly not to be explained as a mere discharge of 'ambivalent' emotion, as when tears and laughter mingle under certain conditions of hysteria. M. Métraux after examining the American facts—and he might have found analogies outside that Continent, for instance, among Melanesians and Polynesians—concludes cautiously that the custom may have something to do with the cult of the dead. Though this explanation may seem to some far-fetched, it is well worth considering. When relations meet after a separation their first duty would be to honour their dead by a rite of lamentation, and such a practice might be extended to cover all greetings of ceremony; quite apart from the possibility that the stranger might in some cases be regarded as a *revenant* who must resent levity in those whom he had left behind. But enough has been said, perhaps, to illustrate the variety of the problems raised by this thoroughly scholarly and successful effort of research.

R. R. MARETT.

The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God. I. The Names and Attributes of God. Jews' College Publications, No. 10. By A. MARMORSTEIN, Ph.D., Rabbi. (Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1927.)

WHEN a Christian begins to read Talmud he is interested, as a rule, chiefly in its Haggadoth, and more particularly in their relation to Christian doctrines and institutions. But as he advances in his studies he is attracted more and more by the wit and logic (of a kind) of the arguments bandied this way and that in the establishment of the Halakoth. But then, if he is thoughtful, he begins to ask himself whether, after all, there is not more in the Haggadoth than he thought, for he perceives that they do reveal the motives and the emotions of a deeply religious people. It is this last attitude upon which Dr Marmorstein insists. His opening words are a quotation from the *Siphre* (Deut. § 49, p. 85 a): 'If thou desirest to recognize Him who spake and the world was created, learn Haggada, for through it thou wilt recognize God, and cleave unto His ways', but he might as well have finished the quotation: 'and if ye have done your part, I too will do Mine.' He goes on to point out the twofold aim of the Haggada: 'the recognition of God and the following in God's ways, or the *imitatio Dei*.' Thus 'the Haggada is still the best teacher to make the human Divine and the Divine human'. He is further able to say: 'In the first four centuries Palestine and Babylon produced many examples of that type of men and women who were inebriated with the glory and majesty of God. Their whole lives, from the cradle to the grave, were devoted and dedicated to God' (pp. 7 sq).

It is not surprising, therefore, that Dr Marmorstein has devoted some years to a study of the doctrinal implications of the Haggada, particularly with reference to the doctrine of God. Such a study is greatly needed, for, as he rightly says, no work exists which deals with the subject which is either full enough or quite satisfactory. Even now he himself has given us only the first part of his complete work.

He begins with a study of the Names of God, and the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. With regard to this we notice that two generations are said to have uttered it openly; the men of the Great Synagogue, and the scholars of the third century of our era. He gives us much curious information about regulations for its use and its non-use, but no help about the pronunciation itself.

After dealing with other names of God found in the Bible, Dr Marmorstein writes very fully about those used in Rabbinic times, i. e. up to about the fourth century. He enumerates no less than ninety-one, arranging them in alphabetical order for convenience' sake. In introducing them he says (p. 55): 'It is needless to emphasize the wealth of religious fervour and enthusiasm, deep thought and high intelligence, which lie behind these words. Many strenuous mental struggles, often lasting for centuries, phases of the conflicts between ignorance and culture, the growth of religious advancement from lower to higher stages, and the increasing war between light and darkness are concealed within these words . . . Internally and externally they purified the air of religion, cleansed the hearts, freed them from superstition and idolatry, and brought salvation to the perishing world under the dying culture of Hellas and Rome, of Byzantium and Persia. . . . The religious genius of the Rabbis in the first four centuries manifests itself as a living and imperishable source of real piety and true knowledge of God, which is unsurpassed in the history of religions.'

Dr Marmorstein then re-arranges the Names under the different writings in which they are found. One important result of his investigations is that 'The Place' (המקום) was a very common Name for God only till the end of the second century or thereabouts, and then was gradually displaced by the title 'The Holy One, blessed be He' (הקב"ה), so that the presence of the one or the other becomes a fairly accurate test of the age of the writing. He thinks that the change was due to a reaction from the growing belief of non-Jewish circles in the holiness of certain men and women, and the consequent worship paid to them.

The last division of this first part deals with the attributes of God, His omnipresence, omniscience, &c. We shall look forward with much interest to the second part of Dr Marmorstein's work, but meantime he deserves our sincere gratitude for the rich material he has put at our disposal.

The Commentary of David Kimḥi on Isaiah. Columbia University Oriental Studies, vol. xix. Edited, with his unpublished allegorical commentary on Genesis, on the basis of Manuscripts and early editions, by Louis Finkelstein, Ph.D., Instructor in Talmud at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. (Columbia University Press, New York, 1926.) Part I, chh. i–xxxix.

Critical editions of Rabbinic works are comparatively so few that another is always very welcome, especially if it is well printed and on good paper, as this edition is. Kimchi, indeed, is not so interesting as Rashi (whom Kimchi often quotes), but is much easier, requiring less knowledge of Talmudic methods, and is more modern in perspicuity of treatment and attention to grammatical and sound exegetical principles. As Dr Finkelstein says: 'R. David Kimḥi's primary claim to greatness as commentator rests on his peculiarly lucid style in which the most abstruse matters of grammar and exegesis are successfully imbedded in a very readable running interpretation of the text before him' (p. xxiii).

Dr Finkelstein's Introduction runs into ninety-six pages, including Appendices, and is full of information. He begins with a Life of Kimchi, in which he points out that while the French Rabbis were chiefly Talmudists, those of Spain were rather 'philosophers, scientific grammarians, lexicographers, philologists and exegetes'. The Jews of Provence, then, and to these the Kimchi family belonged, stood, by virtue of their geographical position, half-way between both, and used the special gifts of both. His father, Joseph, is himself famous, and David owed much of his learning to his own elder brother, Moses. He himself did not begin to write until he was forty, but must have written very rapidly after that to have accomplished all he did, his famous book on grammar, and his lexicon, his commentaries on Chronicles, Psalms, the Former and the Latter Prophets, and Genesis, besides other less important works. On pp. xliii–lii Dr Finkelstein gives a full account of the sources he has used for this edition. He points out, among other things, that in Isa. ii 22 Kimchi saw an allusion to Christianity, a bold thing to say in the thirteenth century. The reader, by the by, will find on referring to Dr Finkelstein's text that *vv.* 5–22 have been wrongly numbered.

His first Appendix is Kimchi's Allegorical Commentary on Gen. ii 7–v 1, which is especially interesting, for although it is found in a number of MSS it has never been published. The second Appendix is a little vocabulary of the *Loazim*, the foreign words used by Kimchi to explain his meaning. These are naturally in Provençal of some kind, and will probably give good Provençal scholars some material for thought and discussion. For example, Kimchi's *Book of Roots* (s.v. קצע) on Isa. xliv 13 has, as one word for 'plane', סימנט. On this Dr Finkelstein writes, 'Perhaps Provençal *cement* or *ciment* "cement", apparently used in a sense not elsewhere recorded, "stonescraper" or "stone polisher" (cf. Lat. *caementum* "building stone").' But Vogel's little Catalan-German dictionary says that Labernia's large dictionary gives for *ciment* also *Kehlhobel*, which is 'a moulding-plane'.

It is a pity that Dr Finkelstein did not place the number of each chapter at the top of each page of the Commentary, but the reader will be well-advised to add it for himself, and so make this useful volume still more handy.

A. Lukyn Williams.

Die Mischna: 'Erubin: Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung von D. Dr Wilhelm Nowack. Töpelmann, Giessen, 1926.

This edition of 'Erubin like the other members of the series forms a useful introduction to the study of the Mishna. The student who works through it, though he will still have much to learn, will have at least a decent foundation for future study. In form the book follows the lines which we expect in this collection. After a brief introduction giving a sketch of the contents of the treatise and its compilation, together with lists of Rabbis cited and loan-words used in 'Erubin, we have the Hebrew text (pointed) and translation on opposite pages with notes at the foot. Text and translation are reliable and the notes, though inevitably brief, are useful. In an appendix are collected the variants of the great Munich MS of the Talmud, the Hamburg Mishna Codex, no. 18, and the Cambridge MS Add. 471 according to W. H. Lowe's edition. There is no index; but a full table of contents goes some way to suppply the lack.

'Erubin is probably the least attractive of the Mishna tractates to a reader schooled in the New Testament for it presents the sharpest contrast to the manner of Jesus in dealing with the Sabbath legislation. This treatise and the Gospels are alike evidence of the practical difficulties which must inevitably arise if any attempt at a rigid observance of the rules for the Sabbath were made. In the polemic of Jesus the letter of the law is sacrificed in order to preserve the spirit: the 'Erub on the other hand—like the Prosbul—is essentially a legal fiction designed to overcome the practical difficulties and at the same time preserve the letter of the law. There is here a definite parting of the ways: and it would be interesting to know just how far back in the Rabbinic tradition the 'Erub goes. Talmudic legend represents the laws of the 'Erub as known to and observed by Abraham (*Gen. R.* 49, *Yoma* 28^b) and as promulgated by Solomon (*'Erubin* 21^b); the Mishna, however, cites no authorities earlier than the schools of Hillel and Shammai. The book of Jubilees makes no concessions, and 1 and 2 Macc. show an almost equally rigid attitude in the matter of keeping the Sabbath. It is tempting to suppose that the invention of the 'Erub falls somewhere in the first century B.C.; but we lack the definite information which we possess in the case of the Prosbul: and the question when and how this device came into existence must doubtless remain a matter of conjecture.

T. W. Manson.

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea: the Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine, translated, with Introduction and Notes, by H. J. Lawlor, D.D., and J. E. L. Oulton, B.D. Vol. ii. Introduction, Notes, and Index. (S.P.C.K., 1928.)

An enormous amount of painstaking work has been given to this second volume which fulfils all the promise of the first in respect of printing and style. The arrangement of the Introductory matter and Notes is good. But if it was intended to provide all that a student needs in explanatory and historical notes it fails to achieve that purpose. It sends one to scattered articles in various magazines, instead of condensing the information to be derived from them. The editors did not probably propose to themselves the final English edition of the early Church historian, and we may therefore take what they have given us as a quite excellent storehouse of references rather than a presentation of reasoned results. Dr McGiffert's volume in the Nicene and post-Nicene Library, with its very full notes, will be of more value to students beginning their work on Eusebius than this edition. There is no reference, for example, to Dr Selwyn's *Oracles in the New Testament*, nor to Dr Gregory's *Oracles of Papias* in the note on iii 39. 1; nor is any full notice taken of all that has been written on διαδοχὴν ἐποιησάμην on iv 22. 2.

But there is a good account given of the way in which the works of Eusebius took shape, and this is of real value. Eusebius was no ideal historian, but he did his best in an age when the science of history was unknown. At least, he has preserved extracts from earlier writers which, however imperfectly scraped out of their contexts, have handed on to us priceless material both for knowledge and for controversial speculation. It is interesting to see that the editors believe, what I have often felt, that Eusebius left these extracts to be copied out by scrupulous but not always intelligent pupils, and then himself incorporated them without grammatical harmonization with his own work. It is well to notice Eusebius's introductory expressions with regard to the kind of information that he passes on. For example, ὧδέ πως precedes an exact literal quotation: λόγος κατέχει denotes that he had written authority for what he relates; whereas φασί means a mere report; and γὰρ οὖν is equivalent to 'I say this, because . . .' A very warm welcome must be given to these volumes, even if in some respects they fall short of that plenary work on Eusebius which all scholars desiderate.

Minucius Felix and his place among the Early Fathers of the Latin Church, by the Rev. HARRY JAMES BAYLIS, M.A., D.D. (S.P.C.K., London, 1928.)

THIS is a very careful and voluminous study, not merely of Minucius Felix and his booklet, but of almost everything that has been written about the *Octavius* from the meagre notices in the fifth century to the present day, allowing, of course, for the long gap between the fifth and sixteenth centuries when the work was buried out of recognition as *liber octavus* of the *Adversus Gentes* of Arnobius. This means that Dr Baylis has read, annotated, and criticized an enormous amount of literature on the subject; and while he seems to be sometimes a little prolix, no one can accuse him of failing to present with fullness and fairness the views of those from whom he differs. He has also added in an index a bibliography of the various authors and articles referred to in the body of the work.

As to the date of the treatise, Dr Baylis is probably correct in maintaining that it was anterior to Tertullian's *Apologeticus*. Opinions on this point have swayed backwards and forwards for many years, and the reader will find in Dr Baylis's pages all the material needed for forming his own judgement. Tertullian was notoriously a borrower from sources which were sometimes acknowledged but quite as often unacknowledged. No doubt the material which Tertullian used was passed rigorously through his own mint and was issued as Tertullian's coinage; and thus the metal received Tertullian's unmistakeable stamp, and passed into currency. The eclipse of Minucius may be accounted for by the fact that all that he said, and more, was incorporated in the *Apologeticus*. Harnack's arguments for placing Minucius in the third century and after Tertullian are drawn by Dr. Baylis through a very fine sieve, and he finds little left of value.

The chief aim of Minucius, as of Tertullian, was not to provide evidences for the truth of Christianity, but to protest against Christians being ignorantly condemned on unproved and unfounded charges. For the most part the Apologists were not seeking to make converts but to demand justice. Their polemic against pagan mythology was really only a retort upon the heathen themselves of the degraded morality alike of the gods and of their worshippers. It was in the nature of a *tu quoque*. 'You accuse us of abominable vices: yet you and your gods are guilty of the same. On the other hand, we teach the Unity of God and the need for a moral life: so do your philosophers: hence on this fundamental point there is no disagreement between our principles and yours. On the practical side, our beliefs lead to a morality of life, which yours fail to produce.'

Was Minucius a Roman or an African? Can anything be deduced from his expression 'Fronto Cirtensis noster'? More, perhaps, from his allusions to peculiarly African deities—Juno Poena (= Tanit), the blood-loving Saturn (= Baal-Moloch). Is his language tinged with what is sometimes called, or miscalled, 'African Latin'? He certainly uses some words in an unusual sense, such as is found only in African writers. If his early life was spent in Africa this may be accounted for. Probably Rome was the scene of his conversion, and there he still continued his practice at the Bar.

It is questionable whether Dr Baylis is right in counting 'two schools among early Christian writers in the *West*', one of which was sympathetic with the past and the other impatient of it. Minucius and Tertullian appeal to the reasonings of ancient philosophers only as *argumentum ad hominem.* They had no real sympathy with them. Western writers held that the Church and the Academy had nothing in common: it was the Easterns, such as Clement and Origen, who delighted to trace in the history and philosophy of the past those yearnings after, and approximations to, the truth which constituted a preparation for Christianity.

Erbsünde und Erbtod beim Apostel Paulus: eine Religionsgeschichtliche und Exegetische Untersuchung über Römerbrief v 12–21, by Dr JOSEPH FREUNDORFER. (Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster, 1927.)

THE first portion of this work is an examination of pre-Pauline Jewish teaching on human sinfulness. It discusses the Fall story in Genesis, and the views expressed in Psalm li, Job, Sirach, and Wisdom. Passing to uncanonical works it treats of the subject in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, the XII Testaments, the Apocalypse of Moses, 2 Enoch, and the later Esdras writings. It then reviews the rabbinical teaching which must have influenced St Paul's attitude. All this is very carefully done. The second part consists of an acute and penetrating examination of the passage selected from St Paul's Epistle to the Romans. The exegesis is followed through the Greek and Latin fathers, and later Catholic and Protestant writers. Here again, all is excellent—granting the premisses, namely, that the story of the Fall is literal history, and Adam and Eve historical personages. It may be, however, that Pauline aspirations and ideals as to the uplift and advance of the human race through the Supreme Example are by no means vitiated by the basing of arguments on *data* which can no longer be taken as granted. In type, paper, and production the book is a pleasure to read.

T. HERBERT BINDLEY.

RECENT PERIODICALS RELATING TO THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

(1) ENGLISH.

The Church Quarterly Review, April 1928 (Vol. cvi, No. 211: S.P.C.K.). G. K. A. BELL The Malines Conversations—H. M. RELTON The Incarnation and its extension in Church and Sacraments—C. JENKINS John Wyclif: the first phase—J. H. F. PEILE Spheterodoxy—W. O. E. OESTERLEY Jewish Marriage in ancient and modern times—F. HOPE Asceticism—H. F. WILSON Durham University—F. E. HUTCHINSON Richard Crashaw—W. K. L. CLARKE Some old books—C. SPENDER The protection of ancient buildings—Reviews—Short Notices.

The Hibbert Journal, April 1928 (Vol. xxvi, No. 3: Constable & Co.). G. DOUGLAS Thomas Hardy: some recollections and reflexions—F. M. STAWELL AND G. L. DICKINSON Goethe's view of Nature—C. HSIN-HAI The essentials of Confucian wisdom—E. HOLMES The mystic as explorer—J. OMAN Mysticism and its expositors—E. R. DODDS Augustine's Confessions: a study of spiritual maladjustment—V. I. KEMP Mystic utterance in certain English poets—E. PICKERING How the young Japanese dream of Oxford—L. P. JACKS 'The lost leadership of the Churches'—C. E. LART Paganism in the Churches—C. M. BEADNELL The new eye-ear—E. I. FRIPP The religion of Shakespeare's father—G. D. HICKS Survey of recent philosophical literature—Survey and Signed Reviews.

(2) AMERICAN.

The Princeton Theological Review, January 1928 (Vol. xxvi, No. 1: Princeton University Press). A. STEWART Jeremiah: the man and his message—J. O. BOYD Monarchy in Israel: the ideal and the actual—E. M. WILSON The Second Coming in the Discourse of the Last Things—W. PAUCK Martin Bucer's conception of a Christian State—J. L. NEVE Arminianism in Holland—O. T. ALLIS An 'American' translation of the Old Testament—C. E. EDWARDS Turretin's Theology—Reviews.

The Harvard Theological Review, April 1928 (Vol. xxi, No. 2: Harvard University Press). B. W. BACON Some 'Western' variants in the text of Acts—W. H. P. HATCH The Apostles in the New Testament and in the ecclesiastical tradition of Egypt.

(3) FRENCH AND BELGIAN.

Revue Biblique, January 1928 (Vol. xxxvii, No. 1: J. Gabalda et Fils, Paris). M.-J. LAGRANGE La gnose mandéenne et la tradition évangélique—E. B. ALLO Aspects nouveaux du problème johannique à propos d'un commentaire récent de l'Apocalypse—P. DHORME Les Amorrhéens—L.-H. VINCENT La troisième enceinte de Jérusalem—Mélanges—Chronique—Recensions.

Revue Bénédictine, Jan.–April 1928 (Vol. xl, Nos. 1–2: Abbaye de Maredsous). De Bruyne Étude sur le texte latin de l'Ecclésiastique—B. Capelle Les homélies 'De lectionibus euangeliorum' de Maximin l'arien—A. Wilmart Distiques d'Hincmar sur l'Eucharistie? Un sermon oublié de S. Augustin sur le même sujet—G. Morin Rainaud l'ermite et Ives de Chartres: un épisode de la crise du cénobitisme au xie–xiie siècle—U. Berlière Les archidiaconés ou exemptions privilégiées de monastères—Notes—Comptes rendus.

Analecta Bollandiana, March 1928 (Vol. xlvi, Nos. 1 & 2: Brussels, 24 Boulevard Saint-Michel). R. Devreese La Vie de S. Maxime le Confesseur et ses recensions—H. Deleheye Trois dates du calendrier romain—A. Hilka Une Vie inédite de sainte Marine—A. Coulon A propos d'une relique de S. Mammès—P. Grosjean Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum bibliothecarum Dublinensium—H. Deleheye Les lettres d'indulgence collectives (*suite*) Ch. V. Les lettres collectives au xve et au xvie siècles (*à suivre*)—Ad Catalogum codicum hagiographicorum graecorum bibliothecae Scholae theologicae in Chalce insula supplementum—Bulletin des publications hagiographiques.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, April 1928 (Vol. xxiv, No. 2: Louvain, 40 Rue de Namur). J. Duhr Le *De Fide* de Bachiarius (*fin*)—L. Van der Essen La situation religieuse des Pays-Bas en 1634—Ch. Martin Note sur deux homélies attribuées à saint Grégoire le Thaumaturge—O. Lottin La date de la Question disputée *De Malo* de saint Thomas d'Aquin—Comptes rendus—Chronique—Bibliographie.

(4) GERMAN.

Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, May 1928 (Vol. lxxii, No. 1: A. Töpelmann, Giessen). A. v. Harnack Κόπος (κοπιᾶν, οἱ κοπιῶντες) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch—E. Lohmeyer Ueber Aufbau und Gliederung des vierten Evangeliums—W. Mundle Das Apostelbild der Apostelgeschichte—E. Peterson Urchristentum und Mandäismus—J. Jeremias Sabbatjahr und neutestamentliche Chronologie—L. Rost Zur Geschichte des Canons bei den Nestorianern—D. De Bruyne Deux lettres inconnues de Theognis l'évêque arien de Nicée.

Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte (Vol. xlvi, N. F. ix, No. 4: L. Klotz, Gotha). P. Knothe Siegmund Jakob Baumgarten und seine Stellung in der Aufklärungstheologie—E. Seeberg Luthers Gottesanschauung—K. D. Schmidt Labadie und Spener—S. Thorndike Marsilio Ficino und Pico della Mirandola und die Astrologie—Literarische Berichte und Anzeigen.

I

INDEX OF WRITERS

PAGE

ANDERSON, W. J.
FRAGMENTS OF AN EIGHTH-CENTURY GALLICAN SACRAMENTARY 337

AYLES, H. H. B.
Jezus, Paulus, & Rome (J. de Zwaan) 333

BARNES, W. E.
L'Anti-Coran (J.-M. Aarifi) 327
'Deux épisodes d'histoire juive sous Théodose II' (F. Nau) . 333
A History of the Jewish People (M. L. Margolis and A. Marx) . 65
Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era (G. F. Moore) 60
Das zweite Buch der Machabäer (C. Gutberlet) 328
THE MASORETIC READING OF ISAIAH xliii 14 252
The Old Testament (ed. J. M. Powis Smith) 219
Die Peschitta des Alten Testaments (L. Haefeli) 330
PROPHECY AND THE SABBATH 386
The permanent value of the Ten Commandments (H. J. Flowers) 329
Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, N.F. iv (ed. Johannes Hempel) 331
See HUNT, T. H.

BETHUNE-BAKER, J. F.
The Church's Debt to Heretics (R. M. Jones) 88
A Modern Confirmation Manual (H. K. Luce) 217
The Expositor's Year Book, 1926 (ed. J. Moffatt) . . . 88
The Works of Fastidius (R. S. T. Haslehurst) 316
Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres (E. Diehl) . . 218
Jesus the Nazarene—Myth or History? (M. Goguel: tr. F. Stephens) 87
Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion (J. Y. Simpson) 217
The New Testament (Rheims, 1582) (ed. G. R. Hudleston) . 216
The Theology of St Paul (F. Prat: tr. J. L. Stoddard) . . 87
Peter, Prince of Apostles (F. J. F. Jackson) 217
Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums (C. Mirbt) 218
Synopsis Evangelica (M.-J. Lagrange) 215
Synopse des Quatre Évangiles (C. Lavergne) 216
The Student's Gospels (S. Mathews) 216
The Uniats and their Rites (S. Gaselee) 88

BINDLEY, T. H.
Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea: The Ecclesiastical History and The Martyrs of Palestine (H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton) 84, 444
Minucius Felix (H. J. Baylis) 445
Erbsünde und Erbtod beim Apostel Paulus (J. Freundorfer) . 446

PAGE

BOYS-SMITH, J. S.
- *The Cambridge Platonists* (F. J. Powicke) 427
- *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin* (N. P. Williams) . 305
- *The Ethics of the Gospel and the Ethics of Nature* (H. H. Scullard: ed. E. A. Garvie) 428

BRIGHTMAN, F. E.
- Six Notes 158

BROOKE, A. E.
- *L'Épître de Saint Jacques* (J. Cheyne) 436
- *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon* (M. Dibelius) . . 50
- *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament: Das Matthäus-Evangelium* (E. Klostermann) 49
- *Das Neue Testament* (O. Holtzmann) 50
- *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (E. Lohmeyer) 48
- *The Synoptic Gospels* (C. G. Montefiore) 47

BURKITT, F. C.
- The text of Exodus xl 17–19 in the Munich palimpsest . 146
- Note on Ginza Rabba 174 235
- The Old-Latin Heptateuch 140
- The old Malabar Liturgy 155
- The Mandaeans 225
- Was the Gospel of Mark written in Latin? 375
- *The Gospel according to Mark in the Ancient Armenian* (A. J. Edmunds) 437
- The MSS of 'Narsai on the Mysteries' 269
- The Punctuation of New Testament Manuscripts . . 396

CASEY, R. P.
- Note on Epiphanius *Panarion* xxxi 5–6 34

CLARK, A. C.
- The Michigan Fragment of the Acts 18

COOK, S. A.
- *Israel among the Nations* (N. H. Baynes) 166
- Chronicle of Old Testament and related Literature . 89

COOKE, G. A.
- *The Religion of the Semites* (W. R. Smith and S. A. Cook) . 407

CREED, J. M.
- *Christ, the 'Man from Heaven'* (B. A. Stegman) 310
- *Christianity according to St Paul* (C. A. Scott) 55
- *The Epistle of St James and Judaic Christianity* (G. H. Rendall) 312
- *The Making of Luke–Acts* (H. J. Cadbury) 433
- *The Gospel according to S. Matthew* (B. T. D. Smith) . . 311
- ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ (E. Fascher) 57

CRUM, W. E.
- *Die Achmîmische Version der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* (W. Till) 207

DE BRUYNE, D.
- Nouveaux Sermons de Saint Pierre Chrysologue . . 362

PAGE

DRIVER, G. R.
  SOME HEBREW WORDS 390
  Erklärung des Hohen Liedes (G. Kuhn) 211
  Geschichte des Volkes Israel III 1 (R. Kittel) 214
  Textstudien zum Buche Hiob (G. Richter) 213
ELMSLIE, W. A. L.
  The Book of Numbers (L. E. Binns) 67
  The Poetry of our Lord (C. F. Burney) 51
FARMER, H. H.
  The Nature of Deity (J. E. Turner) 422
GALLOWAY, G.
  The Nature of Existence (J. M. E. McTaggart : ed. C. D. Broad) 409
HOSKYNS, E. C.
  Karl Barths 'Kritische Theologie' (T. L. Haitjema : tr. P. Schumacher) 201
HUNKIN, J. W.
  AN EMENDATION OF THE TEXT OF 1 Macc. iii 48 43
HUNT, T. H., AND W. E. BARNES.
  PSALM lxxxix 9 398
LATTEY, C.
  A NOTE ON ROM. vi 17, 18. 381
  THE PUNCTUATION OF NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS . . 396
LOWE, E. A.
  AN UNCIAL (PALIMPSEST) MANUSCRIPT OF MUTIANUS IN THE COLLECTION OF A. CHESTER BEATTY 29
MACALISTER, R. A. S.
  The Early Monastic Schools of Ireland (W. G. Hanson) . . 221
  The Law of the Lord's Day in the Celtic Church (D. Maclean) . 221
MANNING, B. L.
  The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort (A. W. Harrison) 79
  Christianity and the French Revolution (A. Aulard : tr. Lady Frazer) 81
  Preaching in Medieval England (G. R. Owst) 78
MANSON, T. W.
  Die Mischna : 'Erubin (W. Nowack) 443
  Medieval Hebrew Minstrelsy (H. M. Loewe and R. L. Henriques) 85
  Tractate Shabbath (*Mishnah*) (W. O. E. Oesterley) . . . 85
MARETT, R. R.
  La Religion des Tupinamba (A. Métraux) 438
MICHAELIS, W.
  THE TRIAL OF ST PAUL AT EPHESUS 368
MINNS, E. H.
  On the Symbols of Abbreviations for -tur (E. K. Rand) . . . 83

PAGE

MURRAY, R. H.
Luther and the Reformation (J. Mackinnon) 320

NAIRNE, A.
Baron Friedrich von Hügel: Selected Letters (ed. B. Holland). 418
La Religion, L'Église et la France, Religion et Humanité (A. Loisy) 415

NOCK, A. D.
A note on Ep. ad Diognetum x § 1 40
Hermetica 41

OMAN, J.
Adventure (ed. B. H. Streeter) 290
The Christian Experience of Forgiveness (H. R. Mackintosh) . 296
Rationalism and Orthodoxy of To-day (J. H. Beibitz) . . 302
Studies of the Psychology of the Mystics (J. Maréchal: tr. A. Thorold) 300
Systematic Theology (W. Herrmann: tr. N. Micklem and K. Saunders) 299

OWEN, E. C. E.
St Matthew xxvi 50 384

PATTERSON, L.
Christliche Dogmatik (R. Seeberg) 194

POOLE, R. L.
A stage in the history of the Laudian MS of Acts . 399

PRESTIGE, L.
ΠΕΡΙΧΩΡΕΩ and ΠΕΡΙΧΩΡΗΣΙΣ in the Fathers . . . 242

READE, W. H. V.
Mittelalterliches Geistesleben (M. Grabmann) 75

ROBINSON, J. A.
St Cungar and St Decuman 137
Latin Infancy Gospels (M. R. James) 205

SAYCE, A. H.
Hittite and Mitannian Elements in the Old Testament 401

SCOTT, C. A.
The Case for Christianity (C. F. Rogers) 426
Kirchengeschichte I (K. Müller) 60
Messe und Herrenmahl (H. Lietzmann) 58
Revelation and Inspiration (B. B. Warfield) 426

SLOTKI, I. W.
The stichometry and text of the Great Hallel . . 255

SOUTER, A.
Some Authentic Acts of the Early Martyrs (E. C. E. Owen) . 314
The Hymn Te Deum and its Author (A. E. Burn) . . . 316
An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin (H. P. V. Nunn) . . 315
The Passion of S. Perpetua (R. W. Muncey) 314

PAGE

TAYLOR, V.

Is the proto-Luke hypothesis sound? 147

TELFER, W.

Baius et le Baianisme (F.-X. Jansen). 198
Des hl. Basilius d. Gr. Geistliche Übungen (J. Wittig) . . 198
The form of a Dove 238
Konfessionskunde (H. Mulert) 200
Nemesius von Emesa: Anthropologie (E. Orth) 197
Theodore of Mopsuestia and Modern Thought (L. Patterson) . 197

TENNANT, F. R.

Essays in Philosophy (J. Ward: ed. O. W. Campbell) . . 182
An Experiment with Time (J. W. Dunne). 191
Faith and Reason in Religion (G. Galloway) 187
First Steps in the Philosophy of Religion (C. Harris) . . 193
Purposive Evolution (E. Noble) 192
Réalité et Relativité (G. Rabeau) 414
Relativity and Religion (H. D. Anthony) 412
Religious Assent (M. Pontifex) 303

TURNER, C. H.

Did Codex Vercellensis (*a*) contain the last twelve verses of St Mark? 16
Western Readings in the second half of St Mark's Gospel 1
Prolegomena to the *Testimonia* and *Ad Fortunatum* of St Cyprian iii 113
Marcan Usage: Notes, critical and exegetical, on the Second Gospel ix, x 275, 346

WATSON, E. W.

Thomas Becket (W. H. Hutton) 324
Archbishop Bramhall (W. J. S. Simpson) 323
William Law and Eighteenth Century Quakerism (S. Hobhouse) 322

WILLIAMS, A. L.

A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew (M. H. Segal) 69
Masoreten des Westens (P. Kahle and I. Rabin) 71
Studies of the Spanish Mystics (E. A. Peers) 73
The Cult of Santiago (J. S. Stone) 325
The Commentary of David Kimḥi on Isaiah (L. Finkelstein) . 441
The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God (A. Marmorstein) . . . 440
Der Kommentar des David Qimchi zum Propheten Nahum (W. Windfuhr) 326
Die Mischna, iv. Seder: *Neziqin: Aboth* (K. Marti and G. Beer) 324

WILMART, A.

Les Livres d'Heures manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale (V. Leroquais) 428

II

INDEX OF ARTICLES

PAGE

CHRONICLE:

Old Testament and related Literature. By S. A. Cook . 89

DOCUMENT:

Fragments of an eighth-century Gallican Sacramentary. By W. J. Anderson 337

NOTES AND STUDIES:

Did Codex Vercellensis (*a*) contain the last twelve verses of St Mark? By C. H. Turner 16
St Cungar and St Decuman. By J. A. Robinson 137
St Cyprian, Prolegomena to the *Testimonia* and *Ad Fortunatum* of, iii. By C. H. Turner 113
The form of a Dove. By W. Telfer 238
Epiphanius *Panarion* xxxi 5–6, Note on. By R. P. Casey . 34
Ep. ad Diognetum x § 1, A Note on. By A. D. Nock . . 40
Exodus xl 17–19 in the Munich palimpsest, The text of. By F. C. Burkitt 146
Ginza Rabba 174, Note on. By F. C. Burkitt 235
Great Hallel, The stichometry and text of the. By I. W. Slotki 255
Some Hebrew words. By G. R. Driver 390
Hermetica. By A. D. Nock 41
Hittite and Mitannian Elements in the Old Testament. By A. H. Sayce 401
Isaiah xliii 14, [illegible] Masoretic reading of. By W. E. Barnes 252
Laudian MS of [illegible]s, A stage in the History of the. By R. L. Poole 399
Is the proto-Luke hypothesis sound? By V. Taylor . . 147
1 Macc. iii 48, An emendation of the text of. By J. W. Hunkin 43
The old Malabar Liturgy. By F. C. Burkitt 155
The Mandaeans. By F. C. Burkitt 225
Marcan Usage: Notes, critical and exegetical, on the Second Gospel ix, x. By C. H. Turner 275, 346
St Mark, Did Codex Vercellensis (*a*) contain the last twelve verses of? By C. H. Turner 16
Mark, Was the Gospel of, written in Latin? By F. C. Burkitt 375
St Mark's Gospel, Western Readings in the second half of. By C. H. Turner 1
St Matt. xxvi 50. By E. C. E. Owen 384

PAGE
The Michigan Fragment of the Acts. By A. C. Clark . 18
Mutianus, An uncial (palimpsest) manuscript of, in the collection of A. Chester Beatty. By E. A. Lowe . 29
'Narsai on the Mysteries', The MSS of. By F. C. Burkitt 269
The Old-Latin Heptateuch. By F. C. Burkitt 140
Saint Pierre Chrysologue, Nouveaux Sermons de. By D. De Bruyne 362
ΠΕΡΙΧΩΡΕΩ and ΠΕΡΙΧΩΡΗΣΙΣ in the Fathers. By L. Prestige 242
Prophecy and the Sabbath. By W. E. Barnes 386
Ps. lxxxix 9. By T. H. Hunt and W. E. Barnes 398
The Punctuation of New Testament Manuscripts. By C. Lattey and F. C. Burkitt 396
Rom. vi 17, 18, A Note on. By C. Lattey 381
Six Notes. By F. E. Brightman 158
The Trial of St Paul at Ephesus. By W. Michaelis . . 368

III

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS REVIEWED OR NOTICED

PAGE

Aarifi, J.-M. *L'Anti-Coran* . . . 327

Acta Sanctorum, Nov. 7 . . . 137

Acts of the Apostles . . . 18, 433

Allwohn, A. *Die Ehe des Propheten Hosea in psychoanalytischer Beleuchtung* 97

Analecta Bollandiana xlii . . . 137

Anthony, H. D. *Relativity and Religion* . . . 412

Aulard, A. (tr. Lady Frazer). *Christianity and the French Revolution* . 81

Baumgartner, W. 'Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel' . . . 331

Baylis, H. J. *Minucius Felix and his place among the Early Fathers of the Latin Church* . . . 445

Baynes, N. H. *Israel among the Nations* . . . 166

Beer, G. *See* Marti, K.

Beibitz, J. H. *Rationalism and Orthodoxy of To-day* . . . 302

Bentzen, A. *Die Josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen* . . . 91

Bertholet, ed. *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch* . . . 108

Binns, L. E. *The Book of Numbers* . . . 67

Broad, C. D. *See* McTaggart, J. M. E.

Browne, L. *This Believing World* . . . 108

Budde, K., ed. *Vom Alten Testament* . . . 89

Burn, A. E. *The Hymn Te Deum and its Author* . . . 316

Burney, C. F. *The Poetry of our Lord* . . . 51

Cadbury, H. J. *The Making of Luke–Acts* . . . 433

Campbell, O. W. *See* Ward, J.

Canney. 'The Magic of Tears' . . . 109

Casartelli. 'Dog and Death' . . . 109

Chalcedon, *Definition of* . . . 164

Cheyne, J. *L'Épître de Saint Jacques* . . . 436

Cook, S. A. *See* Smith, W. R.

1 *Cor.* xv 45–7 . . . 310

S. Cyprian. *Testimonia* and *Ad Fortunatum* . . . 118

Daiches, S., in *Jewish Chronicle Supplement* . . . 101

Daniel . . . 94

Decalogue . . . 90, 329

Dibelius. *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon* . . . 50

Diehl, E. *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* . . . 218

Dietrich, E. L. *Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten* . . 94

Dunne, J. W. *An Experiment with Time* . . . 191

Edmunds, A. J. *The Gospel according to Mark in the Ancient Armenian* . 437

Einzelwörterbücher zum Alten Testament . . . 101

Eissfeldt, O. *Die Quellen des Richterbuches* . . . 92

S. Epiphanius. *Panarion*, xxxi 5, 6 . . . 34

Ep. ad Diognetum, x 31 . . . 40

Etherius & Beatus. *Ad Elipandum* . . . 159

Exodus, xl 17–19 . . . 146

PAGE
FASCHER, E. ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ 57
FASTIDIUS 316
FINKELSTEIN, L. *The Commentary of David Kimhi on Isaiah* 441
FLOWERS, H. J. *The permanent value of the Ten Commandments* 329
FRAZER, LADY. *See* AULARD, A.
FREUNDORFER, J. *Erbsünde und Erbtod beim Apostel Paulus* 446
GALLOWAY, G. *Faith and Reason in Religion* 187
GARVIE, A. E. *See* SCULLARD, H. H.
GASELEE, S. *The Uniats and their Rites* 88
GASTER, M. *The Samaritans* 104
GEDEN, A. *The Evangel of the Hebrew Prophets* 93
Ginza Rabba 235
GOGUEL, M. (tr. F. STEPHENS). *Jesus the Nazarene—Myth or History?* 87
GRABMANN, M. *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* 75
S. GREGORY I. *Ep.* ix 26 161
S. GREGORY NYSSEN. *Antirrheticus*, 12 159
GRESSMANN, H. *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament* 107
GUTBERLET, C. *Das zweite Buch der Machabäer* 328
HAEFELI, L. *Die Peschitta des Alten Testaments* 330
HAITJEMA, T. L. (ed. P. SCHUMACHER). *Karl Barths 'Kritische Theologie'* 201
Hallel, The Great 255
HANSON, W. G. *The Early Monastic Schools of Ireland, their Missionaries, Saints, and Scholars* 221
HARRIS, C. *First Steps in the Philosophy of Religion* 193
HARRIS, R. *The Early Colonists of the Mediterranean* 105
HARRISON, A. W. *The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort* 79
Harvard Theological Review, April 1926 88
HASLEHURST, R. S. T. *The Works of Fastidius* 316
HEMPEL, J., ed. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F. iv 331
HENRIQUES, R. L. *See* LOEWE, H. M.
Heptateuch, Old-Latin 140
HERRMANN, W. (tr. N. MICKLEM and K. SAUNDERS). *Systematic Theology* 299
HIRSCHFIELD, H., in *Jews' College Publications* 9 101
HOBHOUSE, S. *William Law and Eighteenth Century Quakerism* 322
HOGARTH, D. G. *The Kings of the Hittites* 103
HOLLAND, B. *See* von HÜGEL, F.
HOLTZMANN, O. *Das Neue Testament* 50
Horae 428
Hosea ii 90
HUDLESTON, G. R., ed. *The Rheims version of the New Testament* 216
von HÜGEL, F. (ed. B. HOLLAND). *Selected Letters* 418
HUTTON, W. H. *Thomas Becket* 324
Isaiah xliii 14 252
JACK, J. W. *The Date of the Exodus in the light of External Evidence* 101
JACKSON, F. J. F. *Peter, Prince of Apostles* 217
S. James 312, 436
JAMES, M. R. *Latin Infancy Gospels* 205
JANSEN, F.-X. *Baius et le Baianisme* 198
Jer. xvii 19–27 386
JEREMIAS, A. *Jüdische Frömmigkeit* 100

PAGE
Jewish Chronicle Supplement . . . 101
Jews' College Publications 9 . . . 101
S. John i 32 . . . 238
Jones, R. M. *The Church's Debt to Heretics* . . . 88
Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society xii . . . 109
S. Julius I. *Epistolae* . . . 159
Kahle, P., and I. Rabin. *Masoreten des Westens* . . . 71
Kittel, R. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* III 1 . . . 214
Klostermann, E. *Das Matthäus-Evangelium* . . . 49
Kuhn, G. *Erklärung des Hohen Liedes* . . . 211
Lagrange, M.-J. *Synopsis Evangelica* . . . 215
Lanzoni, F. *Genesi, Svolgimento e Tramonto delle Legende storiche* . . . 109
Lavergne, C. *Synopse des Quatre Évangiles* . . . 216
Lawlor, H. J., and J. E. L. Oulton. *Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea: The Ecclesiastical History and The Martyrs of Palestine* . . . 84, 444
Leroquais, V. *Les Livres d'Heures manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale* . 428
Lidzbarski, M. *Das Johannesbuch d. Mandäer* . . . 225
,, *Ginza . . . das Grosse Buch d. Mandäer* . . . 225, 235
Lietzmann, H. *Messe und Herrenmahl* . . . 58
Liturgy of Malabar . . . 155
Loewe, H. M., and R. L. Henriques. *Medieval Hebrew Minstrelsy* . . . 85
Lohmeyer, E. *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* . . . 48
Löhr, M. *Das Deuteronomium* . . . 91
Loisy, A. *L'Église et la France* . . . 418
,, *La Religion* . . . 415
,, *Religion et Humanité* . . . 417
Luce, H. K. *A Modern Confirmation Manual* . . . 217
S. Luke . . . 147, 433
,, iii 21, 22 . . . 238
,, xix 21 . . . 158
Lurje. *Studien zur Geschichte der wirthschaftlichen und sozialen Verhältnisse im Israelitisch-Jüdischen Reiche* . . . 99
1 *Macc.* iii 48 . . . 43
2 *Maccabees* . . . 328
Mackinnon, J. *Luther and the Reformation* . . . 320
Mackintosh, H. R. *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness* . . . 296
Maclean, D. *The Law of the Lord's Day in the Celtic Church* . . . 221
McTaggart, J. M. E. (ed. C. D. Broad). *The Nature of Existence* . . . 409
Mallon, A. *Les Hébreux en Égypte* . . . 101
MS Laud. Gr. 35 . . . 399
Maréchal, J. (tr. A. Thorold). *Studies of the Psychology of the Mystics* . 300
Margolis, M. L., and A. Marz. *A History of the Jewish People* . . . 65
S. Mark . . . 1, 16, 275, 346, 375, 437
S. Mark i 10 . . . 238
Marmorstein, A *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: i. The Names and Attributes of God* . . . 440
Marti, K., and G. Beer. *Die Mischna*, iv. Seder: *Neziqin: Aboth* . . . 324
Marz, A. *See* Margolis, M. L.
Mathews, S. *The Student's Gospels* . . . 216
S. Matthew . . . 311

PAGE
S. Matthew iii 16 . . . 238
,, xxvi 50 . . . 384
MEINHOLD, H. *Rectoratsrede* . . . 90
MEINHOLD, J. *Einführung in das Alte Testament* . . . 90
MÉTRAUX, A. *La Religion des Tupinamba* . . . 438
MICKLEM, N. *See* HERRMANN, W.
MIRBT, C. *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*, ed. 4 . . . 218
MOFFATT, J., ed. *The Expositor's Year Book*, 1926 . . . 88
MONTEFIORE, C. G. *The Synoptic Gospels* . . . 47
MOORE, G. F. *Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era: The Age of the Tannaim* . . . 60
MULERT, H. *Konfessionskunde* . . . 200
MÜLLER, K. *Kirchengeschichte* I . . . 60
MUNCEY, R. W. *The Passion of S. Perpetua* . . . 314
MUTIANUS. *Com. S. Jo. Chrys. in Ep. ad Hebraeos* . . . 29
NARSAI. *On the Mysteries* . . . 157, 269
NAU, F. 'Deux épisodes d'histoire juive sous Théodose II' . . . 333
NIELSEN, D. *Handbuch der altarabischen Altertumskunde* . . . 105
,, *Der dreieinige Gott* . . . 106
NOBLE, E. *Purposive Evolution* . . . 192
NOWACK, W. *Die Mischna: 'Erubin* . . . 443
Numbers xxii . . . 90
NUNN, H. P. V. *An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin* . . . 315
OESTERLEY, W. O. E. *Tractate Shabbath (Mishnah)* . . . 85
,, *The Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament* . . . 100
ORTH, E. *Nemesius von Emesa: Anthropologie* . . . 197
OTTO, W. *Kulturgeschichte des Altertums* . . . 104
OULTON, J. E. L. *See* LAWLOR, H. J.
OWEN, E. C. E. *Some Authentic Acts of the Early Martyrs* . . . 314
OWST, G. R. *Preaching in Medieval England: An introduction to Sermon Manuscripts . . . 1350–1450* . . . 78
PALLIS, S. A. *Mandæan Studies* . . . 225, 235
PATTERSON, L. *Theodore of Mopsuestia and Modern Thought* . . . 197
PAVRY, J. *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life* . . . 108
PEDERSEN, J. *Israel: its Life and Culture* . . . 98
PEERS, E. A. *Studies of the Spanish Mystics* . . . 73
S. PETER CHRYSOLOGUS. *Sermons* . . . 362
PHILO . . . 310
PONTIFEX, M. *Religious Assent* . . . 303
POVAH, J. W. *The New Psychology and the Bible* . . . 96
,, *The New Psychology and the Hebrew Prophets* . . . 96
,, *The Old Testament and Modern Problems in Psychology* . . . 96
,, *The Study of the Old Testament* . . . 96
POWICKE, F. J. *The Cambridge Platonists* . . . 427
PRAT, F. (tr. J. L. STODDARD). *The Theology of Saint Paul* . . . 87
Psalm xxii . . . 89
,, lxxxix 9 . . . 398
QIMCHI, D. *See* WINDFUHR.
RABEAU, G. *Réalité et Relativité* . . . 414

PAGE

Rabin, I. *See* Kahle, P.
Rand, E. K. *On the Symbols of Abbreviations for -tur* 83
Rendall, G. H. *The Epistle of St James and Judaic Christianity* . . . 312
Rheims Version of the N.T. 216
Richter, G. *Textstudien zum Buche Hiob* 213
Robinson, T. *Outline Introduction to the History of Religions* . . . 107
Robinson, W. *The Cross of the Servant* 95
Rogers, C. F. *The Case for Christianity* 426
Rom. vi 17, 18 381
" ix 5 396
De Sacramentis v 8 159
Sanders, H. A. 'A Papyrus fragment of Acts in the Michigan Collection' . 18
Saunders, K. *See* Herrmann, W.
Schmidt, H. *Der Mythos vom weiderkehrenden König* 95
" *Gott und das Leid im Alten Testament* 95
Schuhmacher, P. *See* Haitjema, T. L.
Scott, C. A. *Christianity according to St Paul* 55
Scullard, H. H. (ed. A. E. Garvie). *The Ethics of the Gospel and the Ethics of Nature* 428
Seeberg, R. *Christliche Dogmatik* 194
Segal, M. H. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* 69
Sellin. *Gedächtnisrede* (on W. W. von Baudissin) 107
Semaine internationale d'Ethnologie religieuse 109
Simpson, J. Y. *Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion* . 217
Simpson, W. J. S. *Archbishop Bramhall* 323
Smith, B. T. D. *The Gospel according to S. Matthew* 311
Smith, J. M. P., ed. *The Old Testament: an American translation* . . 219
" *The Prophets and their times* 93
Smith, W. R. (ed. S. A. Cook). *The Religion of the Semites*, 3rd ed. . . 407
Sperber, A. 'Zur Sprache des Prophetentargums' 332
Stegman, B. A. *Christ, the 'Man from Heaven': A study of 1 Cor. 15, 45–7* . 310
Stephens, F. *See* Goguel, M.
Stoddard, J. L. *See* Prat, F.
Stone, J. S. *The Cult of Santiago* 325
Streeter, B. H., ed. *Adventure* 290
Sutcliffe, E. F. *De Unitate Literaria Num. xxii* 90
Taylor, V. *Behind the Third Gospel* 147
Thilo, M. *Die Chronologie des Danielbuches* 94
Thomas of Harkel 19
Thomsen, P. *Die Palästina-Literatur* 106
Till, W. *Die Achmimische Version der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* . . . 207
Turner, J. E. *The Nature of Deity* 422
Vercellensis, Codex, (a) 16
Ward, J. (ed. O. W. Campbell). *Essays in Philosophy* 182
Warfield, B. B. *Revelation and Inspiration* 426
Williams, C. A. *Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite* . 109
Williams, N. P. *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin* 305
Windfuhr, W. *Der Kommentar des David Qimchi zum Propheten Nahum* . 326
Wittig, J. *Des hl. Basilius d. Gr. Geistliche Übungen* 198
Worell, W. H. *A Study of Races in the Ancient Near East* 105
de Zwaan, J. *Jezus, Paulus, & Rome* 333
Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 331

40

THE BOUND TO PLEASE
Heckman Bindery INC.
JAN. 66
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA

ALF Collections Vault
3 0000 106 759 446